

[This Document is the Property of His Britannic Majesty's Government.]

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. July 1905.

CONFIDENTIAL

(8472.)

N
8

FD 406

20

PART I.

CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING THE

AFFAIRS OF ARABIA.

January and February 1905.

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. July 1905.

CONFIDENTIAL.

(8472.)

PART I.

CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING THE

AFFAIRS OF ARABIA.

January and February 1905.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
1	Mr. Townley	980	Dec. 27, 1904	Disturbances in South Arabia. Transmits despatch from Acting Vice-Consul at Diar-bekir respecting rumoured preparations in that vilayet for operations in connection with ..	1
2	" "	982	27,	Aden boundary. Conversation with Grand Vizier as to delay in issue of Irade approving Sir N. O'Connor's proposals of August. Rumoured intention of appointing Abdullah Pasha Vali of Yemen (see No. 3)..	1
3	" "	987	30,	Aden boundary (see No. 2). Transmits note from Porte embodying terms of Irade in regard to (see No. 4) ..	2
4	India Office	..	Jan. 3, 1905	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram to Viceroy embodying No. 3 and inquiring whether line from Mudariba to Mirad can now be settled ..	3
5	To Mr. Townley	6	4,	Alleged ambitious designs of Great Britain in Arabia. Conversation with Turkish Ambassador as to article in French newspaper respecting ..	3
6	" "	12	4,	Alleged British designs at Nejd, and movements of ships. Conversation with Turkish Ambassador ..	4
7	To Mr. de Bunsen	13	4,	Muscat Arbitration. United States' Government willing that Mr. Fuller should act as Arbitrator. Conversation with French Ambassador as to extension of time limit for meeting of Tribunal (see No. 11)	4
8	Mr. Choate	..	4,	Muscat Arbitration. Mr. Fuller willing to act as Arbitrator, but suggests delay in meeting of Tribunal ..	4
9	Mr. Townley	4 Tel.	6,	Aden delimitation (see No. 4). Thinks delimitation to Mirad can now be concluded. Condition as to neither Power sending troops into nine cantons only difficulty. Suggests solution (see No. 15) ..	5
10	To India Office	..	6,	Aden Delimitation Commission. Services of officers should only be approved in measured terms ..	5
11	M. Cambon	..	6,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 7). Suggests that delay in assembling of Tribunal should be provided by postponing date for delivery of Cases. Reminds as to choice of Umpire (see No. 21) ..	6
12	Mr. Townley	2 Confidential	2,	Nejd. Active policy decided on by Sultan. Expedition to be sent against Ibn Saud (see No. 14) ..	6
13	" "	5	3,	Disturbances in Yemen. Transmits despatch from Vice-Consul at Camaran respecting (see No. 31) ..	7
14	" "	9	3,	Nejd. Projected expedition against Ibn Saud (see No. 12). Transmits despatch from Consul-General at Bagdad respecting (see No. 32) ..	8

[1516]

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

iii

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
15	Mr. Townley	11	Jan. 3, 1905	Aden delimitation (see No. 9). Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs respecting elimination of clause in Irade prohibiting sending of troops into nine cantons ..	10
16	Admiralty	.. Confidential	6,	Erection of flagstuffs at Elphinstone Inlet, Telegraph Island, and Al Ghanam Island. Transmits correspondence from Commander-in-chief, East Indies Station ..	10
17	India Office	..	7,	Piracies in Persian Gulf. Transmits despatch from Indian Government, urging representations to Porte for arrest of Ahmad-bin-Selmun. Indian Government authorized to invoke aid of His Majesty's ships if necessary (see No. 35) ..	12
18	" "	..	7,	Proposed hoisting of flags near Cape Musandim. Correspondence respecting Admiralty objection. Transmits telegram to India, with instructions to suspend action ..	28
19	" "	..	9,	Aden delimitation (see No. 3). Transmits telegram from Resident, Aden ..	29
20	To Mr. Townley	3 Tel.	9,	Aden delimitation (see No. 9). Stipulation as to nine cantons inadmissible. To press for compliance with original demand, and recognition of north-east frontier (see Nos. 34 and 37) ..	30
21	To M. Cambon	..	11,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 11). Agrees to suggestion as to delay, and proposes exchange of notes. As regards Umpire, it will be sufficient if Arbitrators be asked to concert as to choice ..	30
22	To Mr. Townley	17	11,	Turkish complaints as to Captain Knox' proceedings at Kuwait, and alleged landing of British officers at Bussorah. Conversation with Turkish Ambassador ..	31
23	India Office	..	11,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits telegram to Viceroy respecting French proposal that list of flag-holders should be included in Memorandum to be sent in by them to Tribunal ..	31
24	To Musurus Pasha	..	13,	Alleged British designs in Arabia. Denies newspaper allegations ..	32
25	To Sir F. Bertie	31 A	13,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits copy of supplementary Agreement as signed (see No. 44) ..	32
26	India Office	..	12,	British protection for natives of Kuwait in Persia. Government of India advocates reconsideration of position taken up by His Majesty's Government. Requests views as to adoption of distinctive flags by Kuwait ships. Transmits correspondence (see Nos. 76 and 100) ..	32
27	" "	..	14,	Aden delimitation (see No. 3). Transmits telegram from Viceroy respecting Sultan's Irade ..	52
28	Mr. Townley	14 Tel.	15,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 31). Not allowed by Turkish authorities to go to Nedjef. Requests instructions (see No. 41)	52
29	" "	16	10,	Reported dispatch of troops to Yemen. Transmits despatch from Consul Richards respecting ..	53

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
30	Mr. Townley ..	22	Jan. 10, 1905	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 28). Permission refused for them to travel in Vilayet of Bussorah. Has protested against unwarranted accusations of Vali ..	53
81	" ..	27	10,	Disturbances in Yemen (see No. 13). Transmits despatch from Camaran. Serious nature of risings (see No. 66) ..	55
82	" ..	28	10,	Nejd expedition (see No. 14). Transmits despatch from Bagdad respecting mobilization at Mosul ..	56
83	India Office	16,	Aden delimitation (see No. 9). Transmits telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice, who believes Turkish Commissioner has received instructions (see No. 34) ..	57
84	"	16,	Aden delimitation (see No. 33). Transmits telegram to Viceroy informing of No. 10 ..	57
85	To Mr. Townley ..	24	17,	Piracies in Persian Gulf. Transmits No. 17. To recur to matter at an early date and ask for assurance suggested by Secretary of State for India (see No. 86) ..	58
86	Musurus Pasha	18,	Seizure of ship laden with contraband goods for Koweit by Bushire authorities. British Consul has protested. Requests that he may be informed that His Majesty's Government cannot protect inhabitants of Koweit (see No. 79) ..	58
37	To Mr. Townley ..	27	18,	Aden cantons (see No. 20). Conversation with Turkish Ambassador. Turkish demand that British troops should never be sent into cantons wholly unreasonable (see No. 77) ..	58
88	To India Office	18,	Alleged proceedings of British officers in Arabia. Transmits Nos. 6, 28, and 30. Asks what instructions were given to Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel. Not advisable that they should now travel in Arabia (see No. 45) ..	59
39	India Office	18,	Status of Zanzibar subjects in Muscat. Transmits correspondence from India ..	59
40	"	18,	Disorders at Bahrein. Transmits correspondence with Bushire respecting. His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" to remain at Bushire for the present ..	62
41	Mr. Townley ..	16 Tel.	19,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 28). Journey to Nedjef abandoned (see No. 42) ..	63
42	To Mr. Townley ..	6 Tel.	20,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 41). Presumes journey to Nejd abandoned as well (see No. 43) ..	63
43	Mr. Townley ..	20 Tel.	21,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 42). Had no intention of going to Nejd. Is informing Turkish Government (see No. 46) ..	64
44	To Sir H. Howard ..	6	21,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 25). Transmits copy of Agreement for communication to International Bureau (see No. 62) ..	64
45	India Office	21,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 38). Transmits despatch from India, and telegram to Viceroy saying that proceedings of party should be confined to coast. Thinks it unnecessary that restrictions should be imposed in regard to El Katr and territory of Trucial Chiefs (see No. 52) ..	64

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
46	Mr. Townley ..	23 Tel.	Jan. 23, 1905	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 43). Treated as prisoners at Hillah. Has protested to Porte, and requested facilities for Mr. Lorimer to visit Hasa and Katif (see No. 43) ..	68
47	India Office	24,	Koweit and Nejd. Transmits telegram from Viceroy respecting approaching arrival of Ibn Saud in Koweit on his way to Safwan, where he is to meet Vali of Bussorah ..	69
48	To Mr. Townley ..	8 Tel.	24,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 45). Visit to El Hasa would be inopportune. To let matter drop, as concession, if Turkish Government refuse permission ..	69
49	To Chief Justice Fuller	24,	Muscat Arbitration. Satisfaction of His Majesty's Government that he has consented to act as Arbitrator. Transmits copy of Agreement and supplementary Agreement (see No. 107) ..	70
50	Mr. Townley ..	25 Tel.	25,	Mr. Lorimer's journey (see No. 46). Turkish Government have no objection to his visiting Katif and littoral, but request that he will not go to Hasa ..	70
51	To Sir F. Bertie ..	52	25,	Muscat Arbitration. Has suggested to French Ambassador that four copies of Cases should be communicated to Permanent Bureau at The Hague, as Umpire has not yet been chosen (see No. 53) ..	70
52	To India Office	28,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 45). Concurs in terms of telegram to Viceroy. Transmits Nos. 41, 42, 43, 46, 48, and 50 (see No. 60) ..	71
53	Mr. Townley ..	51	24,	Departure of troops ostensibly to Yemen. Recent events at Nejd. Transmits despatch from Damascus. Capture of Hail by Ibn Saud (see No. 85) ..	71
54	" ..	52	23,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 46). Have returned to Bagdad. Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs and Grand Vizier ..	72
54*	" ..	53	24,	Condition of affairs in Nejd. Transmits Memoranda from Vice-Consul at Jeddah. Substance of letters from Ibn Saud to Grand Shereef and Vali of Hedjaz ..	73
55	" ..	57	24,	Affairs in Nejd. Visit of Sir W. Willcocks to Bagdad. Transmits diary from Consul-General at Bagdad ..	74
56	" ..	62	24,	Nejd. Proposed meeting of Ibn Saud's father, Vali of Bussorah, and Sheikh of Koweit. Sheikh has written to Vali respecting. Treatment of Sheikh's Agent at Bussorah (see No. 72) ..	75
57	India Office	28,	Proposed Protectorate Treaty with Sheikh Ahmed of El Katr. Viceroy's proposals. India Office would prefer renewal of 1868 Agreement with Sheikh Mahomed (see No. 101) ..	76
58	Memorandum communicated by French Embassy	30,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 51). Ten copies of French Case already sent to The Hague, of which five are for His Majesty's Government. If His Majesty's Government have scruples as to following same procedure, date for handing in Cases might be postponed (see No. 59) ..	76

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
59	Memorandum for M. Cambon	..	Jan. 30, 1905	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 58). His Majesty's Government had not intended to suggest delay in exchange of Cases between two Governments. British Case will be forwarded to Paris for French Government (see No. 65)	77
60	India Office	..	30,	Mr. Lorimer's journey (see No. 52). Transmits telegram from Viceroy. Instructions sent that visit to El Hasa is to be abandoned	77
61	Mr. Townley	27 Tel.	31,	Disturbances in Nejd. Expedition has left Nedjef under Feizi Pasha (see No. 88) ..	78
62	To Sir H. Howard	7	31,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 44). Transmits supplementary Agreement for International Bureau (see No. 69)	78
63	"	8	31,	Muscat Arbitration. To notify International Bureau that arbitration has been decided on, and to inform them of names of Arbitrators (see No. 69)	78
64	"	9	31,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits four copies of British Case for Bureau (see No. 70) ..	78
65	To Sir F. Bertie	61	31,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 59). Transmits copies of British Case for French Government (see No. 67)	79
66	Mr. Townley	28 Tel.	Feb. 1,	Yemen disturbances (see No. 31). Relief expedition reached Sanaa on 29th January (see No. 87)	79
67	Sir F. Bertie	39	1,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 65). British Case communicated to French Government ..	79
68	Nil.				
69	Sir H. Howard	15	2,	Muscat Arbitration. Has carried out instructions contained in Nos. 62 and 63 ..	80
70	"	16	2,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 64). Transmits French Case. Has communicated British Case to Bureau	80
71	Mr. Townley	74 Confidential	Jan. 31,	Nejd. Telegram from Ibn Saoud's father, renewing assurances of submission to Sultan	81
72	"	78	31,	Imprisonment of Sheikh of Koweit's Agent at Bussorah (see No. 66). His treatment now improved (see No. 92)	82
73	"	80	31,	Disturbances in Yemen. Transmits despatch from Hodeidah respecting movements of troops. Question of arming native levies again raised (see No. 84)	82
74	India Office	..	Feb. 4,	Violation of Amiri boundary by Turks near Kataba. Conclusions arrived at by Government of India. Suggests that question of removal of Kalmakin be no further pressed, but that incident be used for obtaining understanding from Sultan (see No. 91) ..	83
75	M. Cambon	..	6,	Muscat Arbitration. Draws attention to title of British Case presented in name of His Majesty's Government and Sultan of Muscat. Cannot admit introduction of Sultan into the Arbitration (see No. 93)	85
76	Sir A. Hardinge	11 Tel.	6,	Koweit subjects in Persia (see No. 35). Inquires as to representations he should make to Persian Government	85

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
77	To Mr. Townley	41	Feb. 7, 1905	Aden delimitation (see No. 37). His Majesty's Government can no longer tolerate delay in settlement as to boundaries of nine cantons. To inform Porte as to views of His Majesty's Government. If any further difficulties are raised, latter will take their own measures for defining line and maintaining their rights	86
78	India Office	..	7,	Affray between Persians and Arabs at Bahrein. Transmits telegram from Viceroy advocating vigorous measures to coerce Sheikh. Proposes to approve suggestions, except as to occupation of Custom-house (see Nos. 94 and 95) ..	88
79	To Sir A. Hardinge	7 Tel.	9,	Koweit Arabs in Persia. Informs of No. 36. To endeavour to obtain same privileges for them as have been conceded to Afghans. Not advisable to claim them as British-protected persons	129
80	India Office	..	10,	Tour of Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel in neighbourhood of Persian Gulf. Transmits telegram from Viceroy. Allegations of Turkish Ambassador (see No. 24) are distortion of facts	129
81	Mr. Townley	32 Tel.	10,	Nejd. Ibn Saoud's father endeavouring to obtain meeting with Wali with a view of offering his son's submission (see No. 83) ..	130
82	Nil.				
83	Mr. Townley	34 Tel.	12,	Nejd (see No. 81). Meeting between Wali, Ibn Saoud's father, and Sheikh of Koweit on the 8th (see No. 96)	131
84	"	82	3,	Yemen disturbances (see No. 73). Transmits despatch from Aleppo. Twenty-four battalions called out for service ..	131
85	"	87	7,	Yemen disturbances (see No. 53). Transmits despatch from Damascus respecting military expedition	132
86	"	90	7,	Piracy in Persian Gulf (see No. 35). Transmits Memorandum presented to Minister of Interior urging that steps be taken for suppression of. Wali of Bussorah instructed by telegram accordingly	133
87	"	98	7,	Yemen disturbances (see No. 66). News of relief of Sanaa confirmed. Town will be in danger again if reinforcements do not arrive soon (see No. 103)	133
88	"	99	7,	Disturbances in Nejd (see No. 61). Reason to believe that large part of Feizi Pasha's force has deserted him	134
89	Law Officers	..	11,	Rights of tribes in pearl fisheries on Arabian coast of Persian Gulf. Reports as to (1) legal rights within and without 3-mile limit; (2) procedure to be followed in dealing with interlopers (see No. 115) ..	134
90	India Office	..	14,	Muscat Customs. Transmits telegram from Viceroy suggesting conditions on which arrangement might be proposed to Sultan for appointment of British Head Customs Officer, and guarantee by India of Customs revenue (see No. 99)	135

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
91	To Mr. Townley ..	45	Feb. 14, 1905	Violation of Amiri boundary. Transmits No. 74. Concurs in India Office views, but matter should be deferred till progress has been made towards settlement of main question of Aden frontier (see No. 118) ..	136
92	" " ..	51	14,	Imprisonment at Bussorah of Sheikh of Kuwait's Agent (see No. 72). To continue to press for his release ..	136
93	To India Office	14,	Muscat Arbitration. Introduction of Sultan's name into British Case. Transmits No. 75, and Memorandum by Attorney-General. Outlines proposed reply to French Ambassador (see No. 104) ..	136
94	India Office	15,	Proposed naval demonstration at Bahrein (see No. 78). Transmits telegram from Viceroy respecting movements of His Majesty's ships ..	137
95	To India Office	16,	Affray at Bahrein (see No. 78). Concurs in India Office views as to course to be adopted (see No. 98) ..	138
95*	Sir A. Hardinge ..	16 Tel.	17,	Koweit Arabs in Persia. Refers to No. 79. Suggests informing Persian Government of Agreement of His Majesty's Government with Sheikhs ..	138*
96	Mr. Townley ..	38 Tel.	17,	Nejd (see No. 83). Text of telegram from Consul at Bussorah. Another meeting took place on 13th. First meeting led to no definite results (see No. 102) ..	138
97	Acting Consul Monahan to Mr. Townley	2	Jan. 28,	Fao incident, and "sadds" of Sheikh at Fao. Transmits despatch addressed to Resident at Bushire respecting (see No. 112) ..	138
98	India Office	Feb. 16,	Disturbances at Bahrein (see No. 95). Transmits telegram to Viceroy in accordance with No. 78 ..	140
99	" "	17,	Muscat Customs (see No. 90). Requests views of India Office as to Viceroy's suggestion ..	140
100	To India Office	18,	Adoption of distinctive flag for Koweit vessels (see No. 25). Sir N. O'Connor sees no objection ..	141
101	" "	18,	El Katr (see No. 57). No advantage in reviving 1868 Agreement. Suggests that question of new Agreement be deferred till general Persian Gulf policy has been examined by Imperial Defence Committee ..	141
102	Mr. Townley ..	111 Confidential	14,	Nejd (see No. 96). Has not yet ascertained details of second meeting beyond fact that Abdur Rahman made submission to Sultan in his own name and that of his son Abdul Aziz. Military expedition under Feizi Pasha making little progress ..	142
103	" " ..	112 Confidential	14,	Yemen disturbances (see No. 87). News not reassuring ..	142
104	India Office	18,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 93). Transmits telegram to Viceroy asking if he concurs in proposed reply to M. Cambon. Draws attention to previous correspondence with Sultan of Muscat ..	143
105	Question asked in the House of Commons (Mr. Weir)	..	22,	Protection of Egyptian pilgrims to Mecca ..	144

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
106	To Mr. Townley ..	59	Feb. 22, 1905	Bahrein. Protest of Turkish Ambassador against action of British officers. His Excellency informed that island is under British protection, and His Majesty's Government had right to obtain redress for outrages committed there ..	144
107	Sir M. Durand ..	34	13,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits letter from Chief Justice Fuller acknowledging No. 49 ..	145
108	Mr. Townley ..	42 Tel.	23,	Movements of troops and stores in nine cantons. Turkish Government anxious as to. Requests instructions in event of his being questioned (see No. 114) ..	145
109	India Office	22,	Position of Political Agent at Koweit. Transmits letter from Government of India, who consider withdrawal of Agent undesirable, but suggest steps for temporary withdrawal ..	146
110	Mr. Townley ..	43 Tel.	24,	Nejd (see No. 96). Transmits telegram from Bussorah. Report of first meeting corroborated. Further details of second meeting ..	148
111	To Sir A. Hardinge ..	17 Tel.	24,	Koweit Arabs in Persia. To inform Persian Government that His Majesty's Government have special arrangements with Sheikh, and that they consider he enjoys large measure of practical independence ..	148
112	Acting Consul Monahan to Mr. Townley	4	4,	"Sadds" at Fao. Transmits despatch to Resident at Bushire modifying that inclosed in No. 97 ..	148
113	Mr. Townley ..	44 Tel.	25,	Yemen disturbances (see No. 103). Further bad news ..	149
114	To Mr. Townley ..	15 Tel.	25,	Alleged movements of troops in nine cantons (see No. 108). His Majesty's Government have no knowledge. To reply, if questioned, that His Majesty's Government reserve right of taking measures to maintain their claims ..	149
115	To India Office	25,	Pearl fisheries in Persian Gulf. Transmits Law Officers' Report (No. 89) for observations ..	149
116	Mr. Townley ..	123	20,	Yemen disturbances. Transmits despatch from Damascus respecting expedition ..	149
117	" " ..	124	21,	Movements of troops at Nejef. Transmits despatch from Bagdad respecting ..	150
118	" " ..	127	21,	Violation of Amiri boundary (see No. 91). Conversation with Grand Vizier. Report from Mutessarif of Tarsus not yet received. Yemen disturbances. Unsatisfactory state of affairs ..	151
119	Sir H. Howard ..	30	27,	Muscat Arbitration. View of M. Lohman that choice of Umpire must now be intrusted to King of Italy (see No. 120) ..	152
120	" " ..	31 Confidential	27,	Muscat Arbitration. Informs of correspondence between M. Lohman and Mr. Fuller as to selection of Umpire, and failure to arrive at agreement ..	153
121	India Office	28,	Turkish accusations against British officers in Persian Gulf. Transmits telegram from Viceroy refuting, and suggesting that steps be taken at Constantinople protesting against readiness with which baseless accusations are accepted ..	153

ERRATA.

Page 8, No. 14, line 1. For "despatch No. 2," read "despatch No. 2."
 Page 55, No. 31, line 1. For "despatch No. 7," read "despatch No. 6."
 Page 71, No. 53, line 1. For "despatch No. 18," read "despatch No. 16."

CONFIDENTIAL.

Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Arabia.

PART I.

No. 1.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 2, 1905.)

(No. 980.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, December 27, 1904.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 969 of the 20th instant, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Acting Vice-Consul at Diarbekir, reporting rumoured preparations in the vilayet for military operations in Southern Arabia.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 1.

Acting Vice-Consul Young to Mr. Townley.

(No. 30.)

Sir,

Diarbekir, December 15, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to report that there has been considerable stir in the higher official circles of this vilayet during the past week owing to peremptory orders which it would seem have been received from Constantinople to raise a sum of £T.15,000 and to provide some 6,000 camels immediately for purposes of transport.

There is also a persistent rumour that Ibrahim Pasha has received secret orders to hold his command, viz., three regiments of Hamidieh, in readiness for service in Southern Arabia.

These circumstances are not generally known in the vilayet, but the impression is wide-spread that preparation is being made on a large scale for operations in connection with recent disturbances among the Southern Arab tribes.

I have, &c.
(Signed) H. WILKIE YOUNG.

No. 2.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 2, 1905.)

(No. 982.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, December 27, 1904.

I REMINDED the Grand Vizier yesterday that he had told me on the 19th instant that the Aden boundary question was to be submitted the following day to a Special Council of Ministers sitting at Yildiz Palace, that their deliberations would certainly result in a new "Mazbatta," advising the Sultan to approve of the proposals

[1516]

B

made by Sir Nicholas O'Connor in August last, which had been already accepted by the Iradé that made such a meteoric appearance at the Porte in the early days of October, and that the matter would be settled in a day or two.

A week, I said, had now elapsed, and I could only conclude, since no Iradé had appeared, that either the Council had not decided in the sense he had indicated, or that His Majesty was not willing to accept their advice. Such being the case, it only remained for me to inform your Lordship that a settlement of the question seemed as remote as ever, in spite of the assurances which had been conveyed to you by Musurus Pasha that it would be settled immediately.

The Grand Vizier assured me that the Special Council had advised the Sultan to ratify the arrangement come to with Sir N. O'Connor, and begged me to be patient for one day more. I consented, but said that I could not conceive that your Lordship would be willing to wait much longer before taking the steps, as reported by Musurus Pasha, which would have humiliating results for Turkey.

Mr. Lamb ascertained at the Porte this afternoon that, after my departure yesterday, the Grand Vizier sent an urgent letter to the Palace, asking why the Iradé had not been issued. To his query answer was made that the decision given by the Extraordinary Council must now be submitted to the ordinary Council, which meets to-morrow. Mr. Lamb was promised that the Iradé would appear on Thursday or Friday at latest.

It is now rumoured that Abdullah Pasha, late Acting Vali and Commander-in-Chief of the Yemen, is to be appointed Vali of that province. As it has been openly stated and acknowledged at the Porte that he is responsible for the delay that has occurred in the settlement of the Aden question, I deemed it advisable to instruct Mr. Lamb to warn the Minister for Foreign Affairs that such an appointment, coupled with the Porte's repeated breach of promises and procrastination in settling the Aden Delimitation Agreement, would make the worst possible impression.

Tewfik Pasha professed to be ignorant of any intention to send Abdullah Pasha back to the Yemen, but asked if such an appointment would meet with the opposition of His Majesty's Government if the Aden question was first settled.

Mr. Lamb replied that, as far as he was aware, it would not.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 3.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 2, 1905.)

(No. 987.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, December 30, 1904.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 195 of to-day's date, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copy of a communication from the Sublime Porte embodying the terms of the Imperial Iradé in regard to the Aden frontier delimitation.

I have, &c.

(In the absence of the Chargé d'Affaires),

(Signed) J. C. T. VAUGHAN.

Inclosure in No. 3.

Note communicated by the Ottoman Government to Mr. Townley.

EN réponse à la communication et au *pro-mémorid* de l'Ambassade de Sa Majesté Britannique en date des 16 Août et 15 Septembre derniers, le Ministère des Affaires Étrangères a l'honneur de l'informer qu'en vue d'écarter tout motif de malentendu et de maintenir le *statu quo* dans les neuf cantons où aucun des deux Gouvernements ne pourra envoyer des troupes, le Gouvernement Impérial a donné à ses Commissaires les instructions nécessaires pour que la délimitation du Canton de Subeyhi se fasse par une ligne allant à Kuddame en dehors de Bab-el-Mendeb, sur le littoral de la Mer d'Aden,

à la condition que le village de Turba, les puits, ainsi que le territoire bordé par une ligne aboutissant à Scheikh Mirat, restent dans le Vilayet du Yémen.

En ce qui concerne l'allusion faite à une cession de territoire à une tierce Puissance quelconque, il y a lieu d'ajouter que le Gouvernement Impérial n'a jamais eu, et ne saurait avoir, pareille intention.

Le 29 Décembre, 1904.

No. 4.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 4.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 2nd January, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, January 3, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 4.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, January 2, 1905.

NOTE has been received from Turkish Ambassador regarding Aden delimitation, substance of which is that, with a view to maintenance of the *status quo* in the Nine Cantons, to which no troops are to be sent either by the British or the Turkish Governments, the Turkish Commissioners have been instructed to proceed with delimitation of Subaihi border, by a line running from Kuddam outside Bab-el-Mendeb to the sea of Aden littoral, on condition that village and wells of Turba, and territory bordered by a line terminating at Sheikh Mirad, shall remain in the Vilayet of Yemen. No mention is made in note of delimitation of boundary north-east to the desert, but promise is given that territory will not be ceded to a third Power. I should be glad to know whether instructions sent by the Turkish Government to their Commissioners will enable settlement of line from Mudariba to Mirad to be effected. Please instruct Fitzmaurice to report on this point.

Repeated to Aden.

No. 5.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 6.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 4, 1905.

THE Turkish Ambassador made to me to-day a statement to the following effect:—

A telegram sent by his Excellency to the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, relative to extracts published by the "Times" from an article in the "Petit Parisien" in regard to alleged ambitious designs of Great Britain in Arabia, had been submitted to the Sultan.

In view of the ancient friendship between Great Britain and Turkey, the publication of these statements without any "démenti" had painfully affected His Imperial Majesty. Such publications were clearly made with the object of impairing the sincere and friendly relations existing between the two countries.

It was hoped that a communication would be made to the "Times" which would dispose of these assertions, and his Excellency had been requested to approach me on the subject.

I told his Excellency that I had not seen the correspondence to which he referred, and I asked him whether he had brought a copy with him. He said that he had not done so. I replied that if he would supply me with a copy of the letter I would consider his request, but that as at present advised I saw no reason for which His

Majesty's Government was called upon to take part in the discussion. It was not our custom to do so, and if we once began such a practice we should never be able to stop.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 6.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 12.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 4, 1905.

THE Turkish Ambassador made to me to-day a statement to the following effect:—

The Turkish Government were informed that besides the "Lawrence" and "Sphinx" now at Bussorah, four other British gun-boats had arrived in the roadstead of Zobeir, two hours distance from Bussorah, and that the officials on board had erected tents outside the town, leaving for Bagdad after an interval. Their names were stated by the Vali of Bussorah to be Mr. Linsyn, a civil official in the Punjab; Captain Gabriel, of the Indian cavalry; and Kiassir, British Agent at Bahrein. They were believed to have the intention of proceeding to Nejd, with the object of persuading Ibn Saud to rise in rebellion against the Imperial Government and accept British protection.

Musurus Pasha was instructed to call attention to these incidents, in the hope that an end might be put to a state of affairs which was not consistent with the cordial and friendly relations existing between the two countries.

I said that I had not heard of the alleged movement of British ships, but that the report that His Majesty's Government contemplated the establishment of a British Protectorate in the interior of Arabia was ridiculous, and I could not suppose that anyone would suspect us of such designs.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 7.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. de Bunsen.

(No. 13.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 4, 1905.

I TOLD the French Ambassador to-day that the American Government had placed at our disposal the services of Chief Justice Fuller to act as Arbitrator in the Muscat Case, but that he could not at present be certain whether his public engagements in the United States would allow of his presence at The Hague within the strict time fixed by the agreement between the two Governments for the meeting of the Tribunal—viz., the 27th May. Mr. Fuller suggested that perhaps the time limit of one fortnight, within which the Tribunal are to assemble after the delivery of the Arguments, might be extended to one month, in which case he could count upon reaching The Hague without undue haste. I asked his Excellency to be good enough to ascertain whether the French Government had any objection to this proposal. It would not of course involve any delay in the exchange of Cases, Counter-Cases, and Arguments, the delivery of which would still be governed by the terms of the Agreement of the 13th October.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 8.

Mr. Choate to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 5.)

My Lord,

American Embassy, London, January 4, 1905.

REFERRING to your Lordship's note of the 20th December, asking me to ascertain whether my Government would agree to the selection of Mr. Chief Justice Fuller to act as Arbitrator named by His Majesty under the Agreement between His

Majesty's Government and that of the French Republic for referring to arbitration certain matters in dispute between them in regard to Muscat which are specified in the Preamble to the Agreement, I have the honour to report that the Chief Justice consents, with my Government's approval, to serve as one of the Arbitrators under the said Treaty between Great Britain and France of the 13th October, 1903.

I am instructed to say that he greatly appreciates the honour, but hopes that it may be arranged in advance that the meeting of the Tribunal shall not take place earlier than one month after the delivery of the Arguments. The time specified in the Agreement is within a fortnight, and I suppose that the Chief Justice's request is made with a view to his peremptory engagements in the Supreme Court, which usually continue till the middle of May. Six months for the delivery of the Cases and Counter-Cases would bring it to the 13th April, one month more for delivery of Arguments, to the 13th May, and it might not be convenient for him, without undue haste, to reach The Hague by the 27th May.

I should have advised your Lordship of the Chief Justice's acceptance in my private note of the 26th December, but for a blunder in the transmission to me of the cable from Washington announcing it.

I have, &c.
(Signed) JOSEPH H. CHOATE.

No. 9.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 6.)

(No. 4.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, January 6, 1905.

DELIMITATION of Aden frontier.

See my despatch No. 987 of the 30th ultimo. Inclosure in this despatch reads "à Kuddam": it is a copy of a communication made to me by the Sublime Porte. I do not think it possible that any confusion with Jebel Kuwahi could have arisen. In my opinion, the delimitation to Mirad could, on the strength of the Iradé, be satisfactorily concluded by the Commissioners on the spot.

The condition as to neither Power sending troops into the Nine Cantons seems to me to be the only stumbling-block, and of this difficulty I venture to submit the following solution, viz., that an answer should be addressed to the Sublime Porte taking act of their having accepted the line proposed in our Memorandum, and pointing out that while the delimitation had for its object the maintenance of the *status quo*, His Majesty's Government reserve their right to send troops into the districts mentioned as heretofore as occasion may require their presence there.

No. 10.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 6, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 16th ultimo, inclosing the Report by General Maitland on the work of the Aden Delimitation Commission, together with a covering despatch from the Government of India.

With reference to Mr. Secretary Brodrick's observations respecting the services of the officers employed in the delimitation, I am to say that, in Lord Lansdowne's opinion, any approval by His Majesty's Government of the conduct of these officers should be expressed in very measured terms.

It is true that the task intrusted to them was difficult and complicated, and, inasmuch as that task has actually been accomplished, the Members of the Commission are entitled to the thanks of His Majesty's Government.

Lord Lansdowne considers, however, that the time taken to complete the work of delimitation was unduly prolonged; that the delays were not by any means entirely due to Turkish obstruction or the inherent difficulties of the task; and that the lack of harmony and frank co-operation between the Resident and the Commission which manifested itself on frequent occasions, was most unfortunate.

It would be invidious now to go into these matters, or to endeavour to apportion responsibility for these shortcomings, but Lord Lansdowne does not think that the case is one in which, upon the whole, any warm commendation on the part of His Majesty's Government is deserved by those concerned.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 11.

M. Cambon to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 7.)

M. le Marquis, *Ambassade de France, Londres, le 6 Janvier, 1905.*
MON Gouvernement, auquel j'avais fait part des indications que votre Seigneurie a bien voulu me donner dans notre récent entretien au sujet du choix du Représentant pour l'Angleterre dans l'arbitrage des boudes Mascatais, me fait savoir qu'il est tout disposé à consentir à une prolongation de certains délais de façon à donner à M. Melville W. Fuller le temps voulu pour arriver à La Haye, ainsi que le désire votre Seigneurie. Mais il y a lieu d'observer que le Compromis du 13 Octobre n'a pas prévu la faculté de prolonger le délai de quinze jours qui doit s'écouler entre la remise des Mémoires et la réunion du Tribunal, tandis qu'au contraire l'Article 2 du paragraphe 4 a stipulé qu'on pourrait d'un commun accord prolonger le délai pour la remise des Mémoires. Dans ces conditions, M. Delcassé pense qu'il serait préférable de reculer de quinze jours la date même de la remise des Mémoires qui marque le commencement de toute la procédure, et il me charge de proposer à votre Seigneurie de la reporter du 13 Janvier au 1^{er} Février.

Je serais reconnaissant à votre Seigneurie de vouloir bien me dire si elle approuve cette proposition. Il y a lieu également de ne pas oublier que les Arbitres auront encore au préalable à s'entendre pour le choix du Surarbitre.

Veuillez, &c.
(Signé) PAUL CAMBON.

No. 12.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 9.)

(No. 2. Confidential.)

My Lord, *Constantinople, January 2, 1905.*
WITH reference to my telegram No. 1 of to-day's date, informing your Lordship that His Majesty's Acting Consul at Bussorah has telegraphed that a battalion of troops from that place have been dispatched to Nejd via Bagdad, I have the honour to state that this report from Mr. Monahan confirms the latest information that has reached me on this subject.

I am assured on very good authority that, after long deliberations at the Palace, the Sultan has finally decided upon an active policy in the Nejd direction, and has ordered that a new and more powerful expedition shall be prepared without loss of time, for the ostensible purpose of assisting Ibn Rashid to crush Ibn Saoud and his Wahabi followers.

The ulterior intention is that the expedition shall, when it has achieved its object, permanently occupy all the principal places, both on the coast and in the interior of the peninsula, after removing all the local Chiefs to Constantinople.

That the expedition is to be conducted on a large scale is shown by the fact that Ibrahim Pasha, of the Milli, has been ordered by telegraph to collect and forward to Bagdad 6,000 camels to serve for the transport of the stores and ammunition.

Mr. Monahan has also informed me by telegram, dated the 29th December, 1904, that the Acting Vali of Bussorah invited Ibn Saoud to that place in a friendly letter some two months ago, and that, about a month ago, Ibn Saoud's father sent a telegram to the Sultan (possibly the communication contained in my despatch No. 862, Secret, of the 8th November, 1904) professing loyalty, but claiming ownership of Kassim, and deprecating the dispatch of troops, which would cause bloodshed.

Mr. Monahan adds that the semi-independent Kaïmakam of Katr also sent a telegram in the same sense to the Sultan about the same time, in which he said that

the people of Katr were hostile to Ibn Rashid, and that, if Turkish troops were sent, the country would become like Koweit.

The Mutessarif of Hassa, Faik Pasha, was dismissed, Mr. Monahan reports, some five or six weeks ago, on the score, it is said, that he was sending provisions to Ibn Saoud. It is announced that Nedjib Bey, an ex-Mutessarif of El Bassan, has been appointed to replace him.

I have very good reason to believe that it was fully intended, up to a very few days ago, to accept the submission which Ibn Saoud had made by telegram addressed direct to the Sultan, and that instructions were sent to Bagdad and Bussorah to the effect that his submission had been accepted, and that the preparations for the military expedition against him were to be discontinued. I do not know what has caused the Sultan to suddenly change his mind, and it would be no matter for surprise should His Majesty again listen to wiser counsels. Well-informed military circles are fully alive to the magnitude of the task to be undertaken, and are well aware of the difficulties to be overcome in dispatching and maintaining a large military force in the inhospitable regions from which the victorious Egyptian expedition had to depart in 1819.

The Turkish Government have, moreover, a formidable undertaking before them in the suppression of the revolt in the Yemen, which would appear, from all accounts, to be assuming such alarming proportions that it will tax all their available resources to cope with it.

A rumour is current here that Sana'a has fallen into the hands of the rebels, but I have no confirmation of such an event from His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Hodeida, though, as I have had the honour to inform your Lordship in a previous despatch, the capital of the province has for some weeks been cut off from communication with the coast.

I have, since writing the above, received further information, which confirms the report that the Ottoman Government have decided to send an expedition against Ibn Saoud. My informant tells me that it has been represented to the Sultan by the Amir of Mecca that the aggressions of Ibn Saoud are due solely to foreign instigation, and that, unless they are promptly checked, the Wahabi encroachments may even extend as far as Mecca. It is reported that Marshal Feizi Pasha has been put at the head of the expedition which is to start from Bagdad shortly, if it has not already done so. It is, perhaps, worth noting that in all the communications which reach me about Ibn Saoud, the name of Mubarak-es-Sabah, Sheikh of Koweit, is always associated with that of the Wahabi Chief.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 13.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 9.)

(No. 5.)

My Lord, *Constantinople, January 3, 1905.*
WITH reference to my telegram No. 196, of the 30th December, 1904, on the subject of the disturbed state of the Yemen Vilayet, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Jeddah, transmitting a despatch from His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Camaran on the same subject.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure 1 in No. 13.

Consul Devey to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 117.)

Sir, *Jeddah, December 15, 1904.*
I HAVE the honour to forward, in duplicate, copy of a despatch, No. 103, received this day from Vice-Consul Richardson, which confirms various rumours that have been obtaining here for about a month past.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. P. DEVEY.

Inclosure 2 in No. 13.

Vice-Consul Richardson to Consul Devey.

(No. 103.)

Sir,

Camaran, December 8, 1904.

FOR the past six weeks, or, more correctly, since the departure of Abdulla Pasha from Sana'a about the close of October last, a part of this province has been in a rather disturbed condition.

The area affected has been chiefly in the hilly country between Suk-el-Khamis and Menakha, where the tribesmen have always been hostile to the Turks.

In an encounter early in November the Turkish troops, who had been moved from the capital to quell the revolt, lost one officer and about a dozen men, after severely punishing the rebel Arabs.

The telegraph line has been cut in several places between the above-mentioned towns, and communication between Hodeida and Sana'a interrupted for some time.

The weekly post also arrives, and is dispatched with great irregularity, and requires a strong escort.

There have been other outbreaks at Hajje and its vicinity, where adherents of the new Imam are very active.

The Vali telegraphed to Constantinople for more troops, and I learn that the Imperial authorities, in reply, have informed his Excellency that six transports are being fitted out and will soon be dispatched with reinforcements.

The periodical trouble given by Zereneek tribesmen was again in evidence during the past month. Recently they demanded the release of one of their Sheikhs who was suffering imprisonment at Hodeida, threatening to cut the telegraph wires in their territory if their request were not acceded to.

It is needless to add that the authorities, who have invariably displayed great weakness hitherto in dealing with the above tribe, complied almost immediately.

Famine is still raging throughout the whole of the Yemen, and the sufferings of the inhabitants indescribable.

I have, &c.

(Signed) G. A. RICHARDSON.

No. 14

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 9.)

(No. 9.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 3, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 9 of yesterday's date on the subject of the state of affairs in Nejd, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad, reporting further respecting the projected expedition against Ibn Saoud.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure 1 in No. 14.

Consul-General Newmarch to Mr. Townley.

(No. 75.)

Sir,

Bagdad, November 28, 1904.

IN continuation of my despatch No. 72, dated the 12th instant, I have the honour to submit, for your information, the inclosed extract from my diary to the Government of India regarding the projected expedition against Ibn Saoud.

I have, &c.

(Signed) L. S. NEWMARCH, Major.

Inclosure 2 in No. 14.

Extract from Diary to Government of India for week ending November 28, 1904.

THE Vice-Consul at Kerbala reports as follows about the recent expedition against Ibn Saoud:—

A belief has long been entertained here by the public that the four regiments originally sent in support of Ibn Rashid had been entirely annihilated, and that Ibn Rashid had sustained a serious defeat. This belief has lately been confirmed by the report of two privates who escaped from their regiment at Jabal, and arrived here about ten days ago.

They say that their force experienced great hardships and hunger while *en route* to and in Jabal, and that a few days after their arrival the Amir (Ibn Rashid) ordered them to prepare for an attack on the enemy.

The Amir placed the Turkish troops and their officers in front, and his own men behind, the combined forces then entered Ibn Saoud's territory, and, without much difficulty or fighting, captured four towns, compelling Ibn Saoud and his followers to retreat.

After that, Ibn Rashid received a letter from one Ibn Barsam in Borreida (members of the Barsam family are found in Bussorah and Syria as large traders), telling him that he had contrived certain plans for the delivery of the place into his hands, and asking him to go there with his forces as soon as possible.

The Amir was deceived, and started for Borreida, where he was surprised and attacked by Ibn Saoud.

The Amir and his men, who were in the rear, escaped, with about 300 officers and men, because they knew the roads, but the others remained fighting, and were either killed or captured.

All reports combine in giving an exceedingly pathetic account of the Turks in Ibn Rashid's hands at Jabal; they are said to be severely treated and scantily maintained.

Two officers—a Mir Alai and a Colonel—were killed by the Amir in Jabal because they refused to obey the Amir's orders, and make a second invasion after their defeat.

The officers here are much incensed against the Amir, but dare not express their feelings.

The Amir has reported the occurrence to Constantinople, and fresh troops have been ordered to support him.

The new expedition will consist of four regiments of infantry, each about 300 strong. Twelve to sixteen guns with men and officers forming one regiment, and perhaps one regiment of mule riders. These six regiments will be raised from Bagdad, Amara, Kerballa, Hilla, and Karkook, and Faizee Pasha, the late acting Wali of Bagdad, will be in command.

The Government has sanctioned £ T. 5,000 for the necessary expenses, but the late Wali has demanded £ T. 30,000.

The reserves which have been mobilized are for the purpose of replacing the soldiers.

Faizee Pasha and these troops are to meet at Najaf, and then follow the route taken by pilgrims to Jabal and Mecca; the transport will be by means of camels, which will be supplied by the Amir.

Besides these troops it is said that another force will be sent from Hijaz, both to meet at Jabal.

It is said that Faizee Pasha is very unwilling to go, and has tried to get off this unexpected call to duty, but has failed to do so. He then asked to be allowed to proceed to Damascus with his troops, and from there, taking six more regiments, proceed to Jabal; this also has been refused.

Faizee Pasha is said to have appointed one Fabad, son of Abdul Mihsin, formerly official Sheikh of the Aunaiza tribe, to accompany him, but, on the request of the Amir, who is on bad terms with Fabad, he was dismissed, and another man has been appointed.

This Fabad is said to be a friend of Ibn Saoud, and he was reappointed to the Chieftainship of the Aunaiza tribe in order to win him over; what exactly was the object is not known.

The Turkish officials, and many others, are looking on these disturbances with the belief that the English are at the bottom of it all.

No. 15.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 9.)

(No. 11.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 3, 1905.

I SPOKE to the Minister for Foreign Affairs yesterday, about the Aden frontier question, and said that it was a great pity that what would have otherwise been a satisfactory *Irade* had been marred by the insertion of such an ill-considered and unacceptable condition as that which said that neither Power should send troops into the nine cantons. I represented that some of these cantons were far removed from the Province of the Yemen, and were in immediate proximity to Aden itself, and that the Turkish Government could hardly seriously anticipate that Great Britain would relinquish such a right over territory which had been under British suzerainty since 1837.

The Minister replied that he did not know how the clause had got inserted, but that, of course, no one could prevent Great Britain sending troops into the nine cantons if she felt so disposed.

I concurred, but pointed out that the matter could not be settled satisfactorily until the Porte had withdrawn a condition which was obnoxious in form, however inoperative it might of necessity remain in practice.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 16.

Admiralty to Foreign Office.—(Received January 9.)

(Confidential.)

Sir,

Admiralty, January 6, 1905.

WITH reference to previous correspondence, I am commanded by my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to transmit herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, a copy of correspondence from the Commander-in-chief on the East Indies Station, relative to the erection of flag-staffs at Elphinstone Inlet, Telegraph Island, and Al Ghanam Island, in accordance with the wishes of the Indian Government.

I am, &c.
(Signed) C. I. THOMAS.

Inclosure 1 in No. 16.

Rear-Admiral Atkinson-Willes to Admiralty.

(Confidential.)

December 12, 1904.

WITH reference to paragraph 7 of Commander Kemp's letter, the Government of India do not wish the Sultan of Muscat to have any dealings with these flag-staffs, which are not on territory over which he exercises rights, to prevent him being placed in an awkward position with other Powers with whom he has diplomatic relations.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE L. ATKINSON-WILLES,
Rear-Admiral, Commander-in-chief.

Inclosure 2 in No. 16.

Commander Kemp to Rear-Admiral Atkinson-Willes.

(Confidential.)

Sir,

"Sphinx," at Sea, lat. 22° 51' N.,
long. 60° 51' E., November 25, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to report that on the 18th instant I received a request from His Majesty's Consul at Muscat to erect the flag-staffs at Mussenden, in accordance with the wishes of the Indian Government. He also asked me to convey Lieutenant Shakespear to Bander Abbas to take over his political duties there, and to take him on to Mussenden to be present when the flag-staffs were put up. Major Grey explained

that as the Government of India had decided that no reference was to be made to the Sultan of Muscat, that he (Major Grey) had represented to the Government of India that it would be better that he should have nothing to do with the matter, and that his place should be taken by Lieutenant Shakespear, within whose political sphere Mussenden would lie. In this the Government of India assented.

2. I accordingly left the same day, landed Lieutenant Shakespear at Bander Abbas on the 20th, and embarking him again, arrived at Elphinstone Inlet next morning.

3. The flag-staffs were erected at Elphinstone Inlet, Telegraph Island, and Al Ghanam Island.

For convenience of reference I propose to call them flag-staffs A, B, C, in the above order. Flag-staff A is erected at the eastern end of the isthmus, between Khor-ash-Shen (Elphinstone Inlet) and Kubhat Ghazira (Malcolm Inlet). It is situated on a ridge about 250 feet high overlooking both inlets. Further to the west along the isthmus the cliffs are high and precipitous, and in our opinion the sight chosen was the best possible, as it is comparatively easy of access. Flag-staff B is on Telegraph Island close to the plinth of the old telegraph buildings. Flag-staff C is in a sandy cove a few hundred yards north of the south-east corner of Ghanam Island. It is quite screened from view from outside. Anywhere on the hills it could be visible from seaward, and this also applies to the sandy beach under Pier Point. A and B were put up 21st instant, and C on 22nd instant.

4. All the flag-staffs were red-leaded, freshly painted white, and fitted with cross-yards, trucks, and halyards. The telegraph poles so fitted make excellent flag-staffs.

5. On the way back we visited the Sultan of Muscat's Vali at Khasab and the Headman of Kumzar Village, but owing to the decision of the Government of India, referred to in paragraph 1, we did not consider it proper to make any reference to the flag-staffs. I do not think there is much danger of their being interfered with, but it would be well if definite arrangements could be made as soon as possible.

6. I would suggest that if possible the Vali of Khasab should be put in charge of all three, but if we employ our own agents it would be convenient if the guardians of A and B resided at Khasab, and of C at Kumzar.

7. Lieutenant Shakespear disembarked at Bander Abbas 23rd instant, and I arrived at Muscat the next day.

8. I would respectfully suggest, as Elphinstone Inlet is a fine harbour, that a sketch survey should be made of the place on a sufficiently large scale. "Sphinx" and "Redbreast" could do this when opportunity offered. Bander Abbas is convenient for mails, and Henjam for telegrams.

I have, &c.
(Signed) T. W. KEMP, Commander and Senior
Naval Officer, Persian Gulf Division.

Inclosure 3 in No. 16.

Rear Admiral Atkinson-Willes to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Sir,

"Hyacinth," at Sea, lat. 14° 57' E.,
long. 84° 43' E., December 7, 1904.

IN continuance of my letter of the 24th October last, relative to the erection of flag-staffs in the Persian Gulf, he pleased to lay before his Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council the annexed letter from Commander T. W. Kemp, of His Majesty's ship "Sphinx," Senior Naval Officer in the Persian Gulf, of the 25th ultimo, reporting having erected the flag-staffs at Elphinstone Inlet, Telegraph Island, and Sheep Island.

2. Elphinstone Inlet is a fine harbour, but too confined and airless for a white man. A further survey of it is not necessary.

3. Khor Kawi is nearer the entrance to the Gulf than Elphinstone Inlet, and is more suitable for naval purposes, besides being cooler and having excellent anchorage for large ships.

4. The temperature of the water at Khor Kawi in July is two degrees cooler than at Basidhu; it is, therefore, less oppressive, and about on a par with Aden.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE L. ATKINSON-WILLES,
Rear-Admiral, Commander-in-chief.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 9.)

Sir,

India Office, January 7, 1905.

WITH reference to Mr. Villiers' letter of the 29th August, 1904, and Sir E. Gorst's letter of the 25th November, 1904, relative to piracies in the Persian Gulf, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to forward, for Lord Lansdowne's consideration, a copy of a letter from the Government of India urging that a further strong representation should be made to the Porte with a view to the arrest of the pirate Ahmad-bin-Selman, and the restitution of the property plundered by him.

Mr. Brodrick would suggest that steps might be taken to obtain from the Turkish Government an official assurance that immediate measures are being taken for discovering and capturing the offending parties, and especially Ahmad-bin-Selman.

Lord Lansdowne will observe that the Government of India are inclined to believe that Ahmad-bin-Selman is being purposely shielded by the Turkish authorities.

In the meantime the Government of India have been authorized by telegram of the 7th September last to invoke the aid of His Majesty's ships in the Persian Gulf, if necessary.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure 1 in No. 17.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Secret.)

Sir,

Fort William, December 8, 1904.

WE have the honour to refer to the correspondence ending with your Secret telegram, dated the 8th September, 1904, regarding the recent acts of piracy committed in the Persian Gulf near Katif by Ahmad-bin-Selman.

2. The papers detailed in the annexed schedule are forwarded for information. It will be observed that, in October 1901, the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf reported the occurrence of piracies off the Arabian Coast, and that members of the Beni Hajir tribe, residing in the El Katr Peninsula, were held to have been concerned in at least one of the four cases mentioned in letter dated the 14th October, 1901, from Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball. In September 1902 that officer drew attention to the recrudescence of acts of piracy, in the vicinity of El Katr and Bahrein, committed by a party of the same tribe under the leadership of one Ahmad-bin-Selman, a notorious bad character. Endeavours were made to secure steps being taken by the Turkish officials towards the arrest of Ahmad-bin-Selman. These endeavours resulted in a communication, dated the 15th December, 1903, from the Sublime Porte, stating that the pirate had left for Koweit, and could not consequently be arrested. It is, however, worthy of note that, in October 1902 it was reported that he had thrown himself on the mercy of the Mutessarif of Al Hassa, to whom he is stated to have personally handed two pearls, and who promised him pardon on condition that he divulged the names of his accomplices and that the latter gave up their share of the plunder. The statement that he had left for Koweit was further refuted by Mr. Gaskin, Assistant Political Agent, Bahrein, in August 1903. The recent cases of piracy committed by Ahmad-bin-Selman go to show that Mr. Gaskin made a correct statement when he reported that the pirate had evidently been advised to keep out of the way; the fact being that he is not arrested by the Turkish authorities, because they hope that as a cousin and subject of Shaikh Isa, Chief of Bahrein, who has been outlawed by the latter, he will prove a thorn in the side of that Chief's subjects.

3. We propose reviewing the more recent cases of piracy in the neighbourhood of Katif, Bahrein, and the El Katr Peninsula, which have for long been subjected to piratical depredations. In the year 1887 no fewer than seven serious piracies occurred between the months of July and October. These were reported in our despatch dated the 17th April, 1888. Of late years, there have been no such outbreaks as this, but the evil still continues. In 1899 four cases were reported. In 1900 there were five more cases. In 1901 there appears to have been complete immunity. In 1902 four

distinct acts of piracy were committed by one gang under the leadership of Ahmad-bin-Selman, while in 1903 he again appeared in the vicinity of Katif, but, beyond an unsuccessful attempt upon a Bahrein dhow in the vicinity of the pearl banks off the Katr coast, no act of piracy was reported.

The details of the several piracies committed in 1899, 1900, and 1902 are as follows:—

(1.) In February 1899 a Persian boat was plundered off Abu Zaluf on the El Katr coast. It was subsequently reported, however, that it was doubtful whether this was a genuine case of piracy.

(2.) On the 11th August, 1899, a boat belonging to a Bahrein subject was attacked and plundered near the Shakta pearl banks in the vicinity of Katif. The pirates are said to have belonged to Daren in the same neighbourhood. The value of the property stolen was not reported, but a small proportion is said to have been recovered. How recovery was effected is not clear. Sir Nicholas O'Connor was, however, directed to instruct His Britannic Majesty's Consul at Bussorah to let it be known that in future the British Government would itself deal with such cases. Certain of the offenders were eventually imprisoned for long terms by the Turkish authorities.

(3.) On the 16th August, 1899, a boat belonging to a Bahrein subject was attacked and carried off near Dhakira. The boat was subsequently recovered through Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Thani of El Katr.

(4.) In August 1899 two boats belonging to British Indian subjects were plundered at Dibal on the El Katr coast. One of the boats carried off and abandoned near Zobara on the same coast. The total value of the property stolen was over 16,000 rupees. Part, to the value of 2,067 rupees, was recovered through Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Thani.

(5.) On the 17th August, 1900, a Bahrein boat was plundered on the Khora pearl bank near Ras Tanurah by men from Daren. One of the persons in the boat was drowned, and property valued at 3,924 rupees was carried off. As the result of representations to the Mutessarif of Al Hassa, a sum of 996 rs. 8 a., together with four pearls, was eventually restored to the owner.

(6.) On the 2nd September, 1900, a party of men, said to belong to the Beni Hajir tribe, attacked a Bahrein boat some 7 miles north of Bahrein, and carried off property valued at 731 rupees. No redress was obtained.

(7.) On the same date an attack was made by men of the Beni Hajir tribe on some Arabs in the Island of Um Nasam off Bahrein.

(8.) On the 18th August, 1900, a Bahrein boat was attacked on the Grainia pearl bank 6 miles north of Ras Rekkan. Property valued at 315 rs. 8 a. was stolen. No redress was obtained.

(9.) On the 6th September, 1900, a Bahrein boat was attacked off Ojair. Two persons were wounded, and considerable property (value not stated) was plundered. Most of the property belonged to Turkish subjects, and was recovered by the Mutessarif of Al Hassa, who punished the tribe responsible for the outrage. None of the property belonging to the Bahrein owners appears to have been restored.

(10.) Early in July 1902 Ahmad-bin-Selman and party stole a boat from Seihat. Stress of weather on the 19th July drove him back to a point north of Ojair, when an armed party was sent against him by the inhabitants of Seihat, and he had to abandon the boat and flee ashore.

(11.) Later in July 1902 the same party stole a boat at Senabis, a village on the Island of Tarut. The Kaïmakam of Katif was reported to have sent an armed dhow after them. They, however, crossed to the Island of Um Nasam; and

(12.) On the 4th August captured a Bahrein dhow of 28 tons burden with gear. The vessel was lying at Um Nasam to load lime for Bahrein. The crew, with three donkeys and drivers, were taken to Thahrān.

(13.) On the 12th August, 1902, by the aid of the above-mentioned boat, they plundered another Bahrein boat of Thein, taking all its gear, utensils, and about 4,000 dollars worth of pearls and 50 dollars in cash from a passenger, a native of Bahrein. They then sailed for Dohat-al-Thalūm at Thahrān, where they landed with their plunder. The owner of the boat took advantage of the opportunity and escaped with his boat—the one stolen off Um Nasam by the pirates. No redress is reported to have been secured in any of these four cases.

4. We venture to submit the following observations on the incidents which are recited above. The offenders in all the cases appear to have come from the mainland. Where they have been residents of territories which are nominally subject to the Ottoman Porte, endeavours have been made to enlist the co-operation of the Turkish

authorities, but only in those cases detailed as (2) and (5) were punishments awarded to the offenders and partial restoration of property obtained. In the case cited as (9), the only one in which Turkish subjects apparently lost anything, prompt action was taken in securing the recovery of most of the property of the Turkish subjects, but not of that belonging to the Bahrein owners. Again, when the base of operations has been in El Katr, it has been found possible, in the cases noted as (3) and (4), to procure restitution by bringing pressure to bear through Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Thani, the leading Chief of that peninsula. The piracies reported recently are of a three-fold nature, inasmuch as Ahmad-bin-Selman and companions first seized a boat at Safwa, near Katif, which belonged to a Bahrein subject, then plundered another boat, the property of a resident of Katr, and eventually committed an act of piracy on a Persian sailing-boat crossing with melons from the Persian coast of the Gulf. The principal act of piracy is that on the Katr boat, which appears to be the first of its kind since 1900, and it will be observed from this case that Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Thani has taken the opportunity of pointing out that it is the duty of His Majesty's Government to grant protection to vessels against piracy in view of the fact that they prohibit the Arab Chiefs from themselves patrolling the sea.

5. The proposal to conclude a Protectorate Treaty with Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Thani of El Katr has already been referred to, and the remarks contained in your Secret despatch, dated the 9th September, 1904, on the subject are receiving our careful consideration, and our views on the subject will be submitted to His Majesty's Government in due course. It is acknowledged in that despatch that the absence of any Agreement with the Sheikh may, in certain contingencies, prove a hindrance to the proper exercise by His Majesty's ships of their duties in the suppression of piracy and the maintenance of the peace of the Gulf. Moreover, the continuance of these acts of piracy bring into prominence the unsatisfactory character of Turkish administration in Al Hassa, and the apathy shown by the local officials in dealing with repeated representations which have been made with respect to losses sustained by subjects of the Chief of Bahrein. But whatever course of action may ultimately be decided on as regards the political status of El Katr, we take advantage of the present complaint received from Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Thani, through the Chief of Bahrein, to urge that a strong representation should be made to the Sublime Porte with a view to the arrest of the pirate Ahmad-bin-Selman and the restitution of property plundered by him. The heavy loss inflicted on the Katr subject affects the interests of British Indian and Bahrein subjects to whom the owner of the boat is indebted, and it is the third year in succession that Ahmad-bin-Selman has committed these depredations.

We have, &c.

(Signed) AMPHILL
E. F-G. LAW.
E. R. ELLES.
A. T. ARUNDEL.
H. ERLE RICHARDS.
J. P. HEWETT.

Inclosure 2 in No. 17.

Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball to Government of India.

Bushire, September 16, 1901.

I HAVE the honour to invite a reference to your indorsement dated the 28th August, forwarding, for my information, copies of certain correspondence having reference to the piracies reported by me, which occurred last year off the Arabian Coast of the Persian Gulf.

2. I think it as well to point out that my letter dated the 12th August, 1901, referred to a separate matter, namely, the murder of Sheikh Selman-bin-Diaij-el-Khalifa, a relative of the Chief of Bahrein, which took place at a place called El Derya, within Turkish territory, last December, and had no connection with the piracies to which the correspondence forwarded under your indorsement refers.

3. So far as the piracies are concerned, it appears that the Turkish authorities have no intention of taking any further action, and I have the honour to forward, for the

information of the Government of India, copy of a letter recently received by me from Mr. Wratislaw on the subject. I am considering whether it will be possible for us to take any steps to bring home to the Turks their responsibility in the matter of these piracies, and hope to be able to submit before long some suggestions on the subject.

Inclosure 3 in No. 17.

Consul Wratislaw to Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball.

Sir,

Bussorah, September 4, 1901.

IN reply to Mr. Davis' letters of the 15th July and 26th August, I have the honour to state that I have no information regarding any further steps taken by the Turkish authorities in the matter of the piracies which took place in August and September of last year.

The Vali positively declines even to enter into conversation with me concerning the claims and complaints of inhabitants of Bahrein, which he asserts are the exclusive concern of the Turkish Government.

I have, &c.
(Signed) A. C. WRATISLAW.

Inclosure 4 in No. 17.

Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball to Government of India.

Bushire, October 14, 1901.

I HAVE the honour to invite a reference to my Confidential letter dated the 16th September, 1901, on the subject of certain piracies which occurred last year off the Arabian Coast of the Persian Gulf.

2. The piracies referred to are as follows:—

(1.) Piracy committed at the Graimiah pearl bank off Ras Rakan, on El Katr, reported to the Government of India in this Office letter dated the 10th September, 1900.

(2.) Piracy committed on the boat of Haji Selman-bin-Haji Ahmad, a Bahreini, on the Khora bank, near Ras Tanoura, Katif, *vide* correspondence ending with this Office letter dated the 22nd April, 1901.

(3.) Piracy committed at sea on a Bahrein boat 8 miles north of Bahrein, *vide* this Office letter dated the 1st October, 1900.

(4.) Piracy committed on a Bahrein boat off Ojair, *vide* this Office letter dated the 1st October, 1900.

3. With reference to the first case the pirates are believed to belong to the Beni Hajir tribe, residing on the El Katr Peninsula. It has not been possible to ascertain who the pirates actually were, or from what place they obtained the boat in which they committed the piracy. The only way that I can suggest of obtaining compensation for the victims in this piracy is to attach such goods as may be found in Bahrein belonging to the Chief of Katr, whom we hold responsible for keeping order within his territory. I propose to visit Bahrein shortly, and will ascertain how far this suggestion is feasible. The second case has been partially settled by the Turks. In the third case no settlement has been effected. In the fourth case most of the property taken belonged to Turkish subjects, and the Turkish authorities have, I am informed, taken steps to punish the tribe who committed this piracy. The Bahrein subjects, however, who suffered on the occasion, have not, so far as I have heard, been given any redress.

So far as these three cases are concerned, I can only suggest that if my proposal to send a ship of war to Katif in connection with the murder of Sheikh Selman-bin-Diaij-el-Khalifa is approved, *vide* my letter dated the 12th August, 1901, the opportunity might be taken of demanding a settlement of the cases.

Inclosure 5 in No. 17.

*Government of India to Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball.**Simla, November 16, 1901.*

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated the 14th October, 1901, regarding certain piracies which occurred during 1900 on the Arabian Coast of the Persian Gulf.

2. You were authorized in my letter dated the 21st October, 1901, to arrange for a man-of-war to be sent to Katif at some convenient opportunity with a view to inquiries being made as to what steps, if any, have been taken by the local Turkish officials to punish the murderers of Sheikh Selman-bin-Diaij-el-Khalifa and others of Bahrein. Inquiries may, as you suggest, be made at the same time as to the action that is being taken in regard to those cases of piracy mentioned in your letter under acknowledgment, for the settlement of which the Turkish authorities have already been held responsible. The Commander of the vessel should, however, be careful to confine himself to inquiries, and should make no demand upon the local officials. As to the case which occurred within the jurisdiction of the Chief of El Katr, a further Report will be awaited.

3. I am to take this opportunity of forwarding, for your information, copies of the letters marked in the margin on the subject of these piratical outrages on the Arab Coast.*

Inclosure 6 in No. 17.

*Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball to Government of India.**Bushire, December 28, 1901.*

(Confidential.)

I HAVE the honour to invite a reference to the letter dated the 16th November, 1901, from the Under-Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department regarding certain piracies which occurred during 1900 on the Arabian Coast of the Persian Gulf.

2. The critical position of affairs at Koweit has, up to the present, prevented me from arranging for the visit of a gun-boat to Katif with a view to inquiries being made as to what steps, if any, have been taken by the local Turkish authorities to punish the murderers of Sheikh Selman-bin-Diaij-el-Kalifa of Bahrein and the perpetrators of certain piracies referred to in my letter, dated the 14th October, 1901. I hope, however, to be able to arrange for the visit to be made before long.

3. With regard to the case which occurred within the jurisdiction of the Sheikh of Katr, I have ascertained that the Sheikh's Agent at Bahrein is an Arab merchant of Bahrein, by name Sheikh Abdul Rahman-bin-Idan. This man usually has in his possession varying amounts of cash belonging to the Chief of Katr, and the proceeds of the large parcels of pearls sent annually by the Katr Chief to Bombay for sale are remitted to his care. It would, I understand, be possible for the Assistant Political Agent with the assistance of the Chief of Bahrein to avail himself of a suitable opportunity and seize property belonging to the Sheikh of Katr of sufficient value to cover the losses incurred through the piracies for which the Katr Sheikh is held responsible.

4. The piracy reported in my above-quoted letter, which occurred on the 18th August, 1900, off the Katr Coast, was not of a particularly serious nature, the property alleged to have been taken having only amounted to 315 rs. 8 a. The piracies, however, which took place in the year 1899, vide correspondence ending with my letter, dated the 19th November, 1900, were far more serious, my predecessor having claimed more than 12,000 rupees from the Chief of Katr on their account. The letter which I addressed to the Chief of Katr in accordance with the authority given to me in your letter, dated the 19th February, 1901, did not receive a satisfactory reply, and these piracies are still unredressed. I forward herewith copies of this letter and of the Chief's reply.

5. Although the proposal to seize such property belonging to the Katr Chief as we can lay our hands on in Bahrein does not entirely commend itself to me, I can see no

* To Sir N. O'Connor, No. 208, September 12; Sir N. O'Connor, No. 361, September 5, 1901 (with inclosure).

other way of obtaining any compensation for the sufferers by the piracies referred to. It is practically impossible for us to punish the perpetrators of the piracies who are probably Bedouins and have no fixed place of residence. If, then, the proposal to obtain redress by the seizure in Bahrein of the property belonging to the Chief of Katr, off whose territory the piracies occurred, does not meet with the approval of the Government of India, I can only suggest that the cases should be allowed to drop. During the current year no case of piracy in the neighbourhood of El-Katr has been reported, and it is possible that the Chief of Katr has recognized his responsibility and has taken the necessary preventive measures. In the event of any future case occurring in which it is proved that the pirates have come from the Katr Peninsula, I would suggest that I may be authorized to at once seize such property belonging to the Katr Chief as I can lay my hands on and to hold the same until suitable redress is given.

Inclosure 7 in No. 17.

*Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball to Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Thani.**March 9, 1901.*

(After compliments.)

I HAVE not replied sooner to your letter dated 22nd Rabi-ul-Thani 1318, A.H. (19th August, 1900, A.D.), in which you disclaim responsibility for the action of the Beni Hajirs who reside in Katr and are in the habit of committing piracies at sea in that neighbourhood. The reason for the delay in replying to your letter was, that it was necessary for me to refer the matter to my Government. It is not necessary for me to recapitulate the piracies which have taken place during recent years in the neighbourhood of Katr; but the object of my now writing to you is to impress on you the fact that my Government view the occurrence of piracies in any part of the Persian Gulf with extreme displeasure, that they cannot admit your disclaimer of responsibility for control of the Bedouins who reside in El-Katr and that, if necessary, steps will be taken to bring this responsibility home to you. You should lose no time in warning all owners of boats residing on the coast of El-Katr that they must be careful not to allow their boats to be used by these Bedouin marauders, as in future it will be necessary to hold the owners of boats, which are used by the pirates, responsible.

I trust that you will accept this warning in the friendly spirit in which it is sent, and that you will take steps to prevent piracies occurring in future.

Inclosure 8 in No. 17.

Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Thani to Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball.

(Translation.)

(After compliments.)

29 Zil Hijah, 1318 (April 19, 1901).

I HAVE received your letter dated 17th Zil Kadeh 1318 (9th March, 1901), and understood contents which especially related to crimes committed at sea chiefly by the Beni Hajirs. Believe me that as regards the past, the people of Katr have, for the last four years, done nothing, and what the Beni Hajirs have done is on account of their spite against the Katr people. All this time many of the Beni Hajirs have settled in Katr and we keep them in check from committing misdeeds, but if they did anything we take them to task as far as possible. They gradually remove themselves and only a small number of them remains in Katr now. They are not in Katr now and the piracy which they have committed took place elsewhere than in Katr waters. This year none of them have remained in Katr. They are in the neighbourhood of Katr. As the Government of all this territory appertains to the Turks who carry it on through the Mutessarif of El-Hassa, I have no power to turn them out, be they Arabs or Beni Hajirs. Our relations with the Bedouin Arabs are of the same nature as of old and they are not in accordance with law. We sometimes fight them and sometimes live in peace with them. We are in such relations with them. I am not responsible to them unless they have claims against me and they are not responsible to me except when they are under my obligation. For whatever they do and whenever they rob men, I exert myself, and I do so to please the British Government. God knows that I do not fail in my endeavours. More than this I cannot do. You say that the Katr and Bahrein people do not take

[1516]

F

care of their boats and allow them to be used by pirates by which they (the boat owners) suffer loss; do not believe that such is the case. Also that they (boat owners) could prevent them (the pirates) if they saw them near the shore; this is not possible, because the number of the crew is small and they have no power to oppose or prevent.

Inclosure 9 in No. 17.

Government of India to Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball.

Fort William, February 6, 1902.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated the 28th December 1901, on the subject of certain piracies which occurred off the El-Katr Peninsula during the years 1899 and 1900.

2. Your letter deals with three cases of piracy, two of which occurred in August 1899, while the third dates from August 1900. In the third case the stolen property is valued at 315 rs. 8 a. only, but in the two earlier cases property of the value of more than 12,000 rupees is alleged to have been plundered. It is understood that of the property stolen in the two piracies which occurred in August 1899, a portion valued at about 2,067 rupees has been recovered by Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Thani, the Ruling Sheikh of El-Katr, but that no effort has been made by him to recover the remainder of the property which was looted on those two occasions or to exact redress from the Bedouins who committed the smaller outrage at Graimia Pearl Bank in August 1900. You now suggest that, in order to obtain compensation for the sufferers by these piracies, the property of the El-Katr Chief in Bahrein should be attached, or that, as an alternative, the cases should be allowed to drop. A third alternative, which was suggested in your letter, dated the 19th November, 1900, would be to send a boat expedition to punish the villages from which the pirates embarked.

3. The Government of India have decided, in view of the time which has elapsed since the occurrence of these piracies, and of certain pre-occupations in other parts of the Persian Gulf, that active measures for the exaction of redress from the Sheikh of El-Katr or from the offending villages cannot now be wisely or profitably undertaken, and that the cases must be allowed to drop. Having regard, however, to the language held by Colonel Meade to the Sheikh in November 1899, the Government of India have come to their present decision with reluctance, and they cannot but regret that, owing to the want of definite proposals from two successive Political Residents, the opportunity for exacting full and timely reparation for these outrages should have been allowed to pass. In the opinion of the Government of India, some speedy measures of redress should be adopted in future if such outrages are repeated; and, in the event of any fresh case of piracy occurring off the El-Katr Peninsula, the Political Resident should not only cause the property of the Katr Chief in Bahrein to be attached until redress is given, but should also submit proposals at once for a boat expedition against the villages immediately concerned, if that appears to be the best and most effective method of inflicting punishment and enforcing reparation.

Inclosure 10 in No. 17.

Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball to Government of India.

Shiraz, September 13, 1902.

IN continuation of the correspondence ending with your letter dated the 6th February, 1902, I have the honour to report, for the information of the Government of India, the recrudescence of acts of piracy, in the vicinity of El-Katr and Bahrein, committed by a party of Beni Hajir Arabs under the leadership of one Ahmad-bin-Selman, a notorious bad character.

2. Early in July this man succeeded in stealing a boat from Seihat, but stress of weather on the 19th July drove him back to a point north of Ojair, on hearing of which the inhabitants of Seihat sent an armed boat party against him, obliging him to abandon his craft and flee ashore.

* Secret, dated November 1900.

3. Some days later Ahmad and his gang stole a boat at Senalis with which they crossed to the island of Um Nasan, and on the 4th August captured a Bahrein dhow of 28 tons burden which was lying there to load lime for Bahrein, by means of which dhow some ten days later they waylaid and robbed another Bahrein boat, off Thaein in the Katr Peninsula, of its entire gear and utensils as well as of cash and pearls, the property of a trader on board, to the total value of some 5,400 dollars, and then proceeded to Dohat Thalam in Thahrin, south of Katif, in Turkish territory, where they landed with their plunder.

4. The Assistant Political Agent, Bahrein, informs me that Ahmad-bin-Selman, of whose nationality I am not yet aware, had been residing recently at Sweisima, in El-Katr territory, where his family now is, and as these piracies seem to have occurred in El-Katr waters, while some of the property plundered from the first Bahrein boat was disposed of at places under the jurisdiction of the Sheikh of El-Katr, it seems a case to apply the orders conveyed in paragraph 3 of your letter above quoted, and I have instructed the Assistant Political Agent accordingly, who, I may mention, had already warned Sheikh Ahmad-bin-Thani that he would be held responsible, and had also requested the Kaïmakam of Katif to co-operate in suppressing Ahmad and his gang.

5. His Britannic Majesty's Consul at Bussorah has been requested to move the Wali to send strict orders to his subordinates to take energetic measures, and informs me that he has done so, and the Senior Naval Officer, Persian Gulf, is arranging, at my request, to depute a gunboat to Bahrein with a view to concerting measures, either by means of a boat expedition or otherwise, to put down this gang.

6. I have not considered it advisable to accede to a request of the Sheikh Isa of Bahrein that he might be permitted to dispatch an expedition against Ahmad, owing to the probability that the pursuit would lead the Bahreinese into Turkish waters and possibly into Turkish territories, and thus produce inconvenient complications.

Inclosure 11 in No. 17.

Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball to Government of India.

Bussorah, September 22, 1902.

IN continuation of this office letter dated the 13th instant, regarding the acts of piracy committed by Arabs under the leadership of Ahmad-bin-Selman, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, copy of a letter which I have received from His Britannic Majesty's Consul, Bussorah, on the subject.

Inclosure 12 in No. 17.

Consul Wratislaw to Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball.

Bussorah, September 12, 1902.

IN reply to Captain Hunt's letters of the 18th August and of the 1st September, concerning the piracies of Ahmad-bin-Selman off the coast of Katif, I have the honour to inclose herewith copies of two letters I have addressed to the Wali of Bussorah on the subject, and also a translation of his Excellency's reply.

I hear that the Turkish gunboat "Kilid-el-Bahr" is shortly to be sent down the Arab coast; but so decrepit a vessel, even if she eventually starts, can be of but little use for the prevention of piracy. The fact is that the local Turkish Government seems quite unable to maintain order either by land or sea in the districts for which it is responsible.

Inclosure 13 in No. 17.

Consul Wratislaw to Mustafa Nouri Pasha.

Bussorah, August 22, 1902.

FROM information received from the British Agent in the Island of Bahrein, it appears that a notorious outlaw named Ahmad-bin-Selman has collected a band of Bedouins from the Katif district and is committing piracies in those waters. He is

actually in possession of a large Bahrein sailing vessel which he captured at the Island of Um Nasan, it is very necessary that he should be captured.

The British Agent has already communicated with the Kaimakam of Katif about this matter, and I beg that your Excellency will also send the necessary instructions to the spot.

Inclosure 14 in No. 17.

Consul Wratishaw to Mustafa Nouri Pasha.

Bussorah, September 3, 1902.

WITH reference to my letter to your Excellency of the 22nd August, I have the honour to inform your Excellency that the pirate Ahmad-bin-Selman has employed the vessel which he captured at Um Nasan in the capture of another Bahrein boom near Thaein, from which he looted money and pearls to the value of 5,400 rupees (*sic*).

After committing this crime the pirates are reported to have returned to Dohat Thalam in Thahrar, south of Katif, and to have landed the stolen property in Turkish territory. Considering that the previous piracies referred to in my letter of the 10th December, 1901, still remain unpunished, I beg that your Excellency will kindly inform me whether the resources at the disposal of the local Turkish authorities are sufficient to insure the arrest and punishment of these malefactors or whether it is desirable that a British vessel of war should be sent to assist in maintaining the security of the coast of Katif.

Inclosure 15 in No. 17.

Mustafa Nouri Pasha to Consul Wratishaw.

(Translation.)

September 6, 1902.

HAVING read your letter of the 3rd September, 1902, I beg to say that, on receipt of your letter of the 22nd August, the necessary communications were made to the Governor of Nejd, and that on receipt of reply to a second and urgent message to him pointing out the serious nature of the question, the vilayet will take the necessary steps and endeavour to procure the restitution of the stolen property and the punishment of the delinquents. I beg to add that there is no need to send a steamer to help in the matter, thanks to the protecting arm of the Padshah.

Sent to His Majesty's Resident and Consul-General, Bushire, with the compliments of the undersigned.

Inclosure 16 in No. 17.

Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball to Government of India.

Bushire, December 8, 1902.

I HAVE the honour to invite a reference to the correspondence ending with my letter dated the 22nd September, 1902, on the subject of certain piracies committed upon Behrein boats by Ahmad-bin-Selman.

As a result of further inquiries, it transpired that the pirate Ahmad-bin-Selman is not a subject of the Chief of Katr. He belongs to the Al Khalifa family of Bahrein, and is, therefore, a subject of the Chief of Bahrein. He has, however, been for some time an outlaw from Bahrein and has resided in Katr, but he had left Katr long before the present piracies occurred, and had removed to Turkish territory, whence he set forth on his piratical expedition. His family is living at present in Bahrein. It would not, therefore, be just to hold the Chief of Katr responsible; and the Chief of Bahrein, who was consulted in the matter, has stated that he does not think that the Chief of Katr is in any way responsible to him on account of these piracies, and he objected under the circumstances to take any steps with regard to the Katr Chief's property in Bahrein.

2. There is no doubt that the pirate Ahmad-bin-Selman is now in Turkish territory, where the proceeds of the piracy on the Behrein boat committed off Katr were taken.

From a recent report from the Assistant Political Agent at Bahrein dated the 30th November, 1902, copy of which is herewith forwarded, it appears that he has actually been in the hands of the Turkish authorities. It is very desirable that steps should now be taken to prevent this pirate from doing any further mischief, and I will bring the facts to the knowledge of His Britannic Majesty's Consul at Bussorah.

3. When I was recently at Bahrein, the Chief spoke to me on the subject of piracies, and said that he would be very glad if permission could be granted to him to proceed in pursuit of pirates by sea. He stated that it occasionally happened that information reached him of the whereabouts of a pirate, and that, if he was able to act immediately upon the receipt of such information, and was permitted to send away an armed dhow in pursuit, he was confident that he would be able to impose a check on piracies in the neighbourhood of Bahrein. He expressed the opinion that the fact of it being known that he had such permission from the British Government would of itself act as a deterrent to intending pirates, and he readily agreed to abide by any restrictions which the British Government might choose to impose as to the limits within which his boats might cruise. He agreed to consult the Political Officer at Bahrein prior to sending an armed dhow to sea, and also to put a responsible and trustworthy official in charge of the dhow which he sent in pursuit of pirates. I informed the Chief that I would refer his request to the Government of India, as I could not myself give him the permission, and I instructed Mr. Gaskin to submit an official report to me on the subject.

4. The Government of India is aware of the difficulties which exist in the way of our ships of war taking any active steps in the matter of these piracies which generally occur towards the close of the pearling season. The information about a piracy only reaches us after the piracy has been committed; and in any case it is practically impossible for our ships of war to put down this kind of piracy.

I am inclined, therefore, to think that the Chief of Bahrein might be given the permission for which he asks on the conditions that before he sends an armed boat to sea, the permission of the Assistant Political Agent at Bahrein is first asked, that one of his sons or other responsible person is put in charge of the boat, and that the operations of the boat are confined to the seas between a point north of Ras Tanoura and eastward round the Katr Peninsula towards the neighbourhood of Al-Bidaa.

Inclosure 17 in No. 17.

Mr. Gaskin to Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball.

Bahrein, November 30, 1902.

WITH reference to correspondence ending with this office letter, dated the 21st September, 1902, I have the honour to report that one named Sayyid Abdullah-bin-Ibrahim, a connection of Sayyid-Ali-bin-Hussein, the victim of the piracy committed by Ahmad-bin-Selman in Katr waters, on the 12th August, 1902, wrote to Seyyid Talib, the Mutessarif of Al-Hassa, regarding the piracy, begging him to recover the stolen property; and from the Mutessarif's reply, dated the 22nd October, 1902, to Seyyid Abdullah-bin-Ibrahim, it appears that Ahmad-bin-Selman has thrown himself on the mercy of the Mutessarif, who has promised him pardon on condition that he divulges the names of his accomplices, who are to give up their share of the plunder; that two pearls have been recovered from Ahmad, and they are being kept in safe custody until the rest of the stolen property is recovered; and that the slave boy was recovered, and had been sent to Bahrein.

Since the receipt of the Mutessarif's letter, the slave boy has come to Bahrein. It will be observed from the context of the letter, a translation of which is transmitted for your information, that the pirate is evidently in Al-Hassa, and if the Mutessarif desired it he can easily be taken into custody, and information from other sources corroborates these facts, but it seems that the policy of the Turks is to take no notice of matters referred to them by our Government, and they are ready to move in cases which are reported to them direct by the Chief of Bahrein or his subjects.

As experience has shown that the action of His Majesty's ships and our reference to the Turkish Government for redress have hitherto proved futile, it remains that some more effective measures be adopted to put a stop to the recurrence of piracies in these waters.

[1516]

G

I therefore venture to bring forward, for your consideration, a suggestion of the Chief of Bahrein, that he may be allowed to assist in the matter of putting down piracies. He has repeatedly expressed to me his desire to obtain the permission of the Government of India to have in readiness during the pearling season, an armed boat under one of his sons to proceed against the pirates directly information is received of their having taken to sea. In his remarks to me he laid much stress on the fact that, though the Government of India have been good enough to take up all cases of piracies reported to them, and such measures as have been possible under the difficult circumstances have been taken, it is unfortunate that, owing to the lapse of time usually occurring between the date on which the piracies are committed and the arrival of His Majesty's ship of war on the scene, the pirates are able to get away, and to the apathy of the Turkish Government in matters concerning Bahrein, the subsequent references to that Government generally prove abortive; and he thinks, and I agree with him, that local measures are likely to prove a success.

The fact that the pirates getting to know that the Chief of Bahrein has been given permission to take active measures against them in the event of their proceeding on depredatory expeditions at sea, will in itself, in my opinion, be a check on them, and, as generally information of intended expeditions is forthcoming prior to their start, the Chief can fall in with them before any serious mischief is done. I am of opinion that so long as the Chief on each occasion consults the Assistant Political Agent, and limits his action to pursuing pirates only and confining his independent operations or giving assistance to a British gun-boat whenever one is present within the seas between 25° 20' and 26° 50' north latitudes and abstains from entering Turkish waters when a Turkish gun-boat is present, there can be no serious objections.

Inclosure 18 in No. 17.

Sayyid Thalib to Sayyid Abdulla-bin-Ibrahim.

(Translation.)

(After compliments.)

October 22, 1902.

I HAVE received your letter dated the 11th November, 1902, and all that you stated has been understood.

Ahmed-bin-Selman asked for mercy, and his taking refuge has been accepted on condition that he will give the names of his companions and each of them gives up his share of the plunder. I have found in his possession two pearls only, and they are in my safe custody until the final results are obtained. I have sent you your freed slave, and, please God, shortly I will do the necessary towards the discovering of your property.

May you continue in security!

Inclosure 19 in No. 17.

Captain de Vere Hunt to Government of India.

Bushire, July 23, 1903.

WITH reference to the correspondence ending with Lieutenant-Colonel Kemball's demi-official letter, dated the 10th July, 1903, to Mr. Russell, on the subject of piracies in Bahrein waters, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, copy of the correspondence which has passed between me and His Majesty's Acting Consul at Bussorah regarding the reappearance of the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman in the vicinity of Katif.

Inclosure 20 in No. 17.

Captain de Vere Hunt to Acting Consul Crow.

(Telegraphic.)

July 13, 1903.

I AM informed that the notorious pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman, with three or four companions, is with the Amair tribe at present encamped on outskirts of Katif, and is awaiting a favourable opportunity to recommence his piratical career.

Can you induce the Vali to take vigorous action with a view to his arrest?

Inclosure 21 in No. 17.

Acting Consul Crow to Captain de Vere Hunt.

Bussorah, July 15, 1903.

ON receipt of your telegram of the 13th instant in regard to the movements of Ahmed-bin-Selman, I called on the Vali and handed him a translation of the substance of your message. I pointed out that he had already addressed the Mutessarif of Nejd several times on the subject, and had received no reply. I reminded him that Ahmed-bin-Selman was a standing menace to traffic in Bahrein waters, and that orders were sent by the Porte in 1902 to pursue and capture him. I asked the Vali to give his serious attention to the matter, more especially as the date season was now approaching and I anticipated interference with the Indian sailing-vessels.

His Excellency took the translation of the telegram and promised to give the matter his immediate attention.

Inclosure 22 in No. 17.

Captain de Vere Hunt to Government of India.

Bushire, July 23, 1903.

IN continuation of my letter, dated the 23rd instant, regarding the reappearance of the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman in the vicinity of Katif, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, copy of a letter which I have received from the Assistant Political Agent, Bahrein, on the subject.

Inclosure 23 in No. 17.

Mr. Gaskin to Captain de Vere Hunt.

Bahrein, July 18, 1903.

IN continuation of my Report dated the 11th July, 1903, I have the honour to report that, in accordance with my advice, the Chief of Bahrein sent a detective to watch Ahmed-bin-Selman's movements, and last night the Chief sent me a message to the effect that the person sent by him to the mainland has just returned, and reported that the pirate, with four Amair tribesmen, has obtained a boat and is now at Saihat, 4 miles below Katif, preparing to put to sea.

There are generally a large Bahrein boat or two at the Island of Um Nasan, and it is likely that the pirates will make for that island with a view to obtain a boat suitable to their purpose. I have instructed the Chief to send about ten reliable men to the island to capture the pirates should they land there. Um Nasan being one of the Bahrein group and belonging to the Chief, no complication can arise. I have also advised the Chief to warn all boats putting to sea to keep a look-out for the pirates.

The Turks have had ample warning, but the only action they will take will be to send a small boat, with five or six soldiers, from Katif across to Bahrein and back again, to impress us with an idea that they are looking for the pirates.

Inclosure 24 in No. 17.

Captain de Vere Hunt to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, August 12, 1903.

INFORMATION has been brought to me of the appearance of a gang of Beni Hajir pirates—probably that of Ahmed-bin-Selman—in the vicinity of the pearl banks off the Katr Coast, and of an unsuccessful attempt by them upon a dhow.

(Addressed to the Consul at Bussorah; repeated to Foreign, Simla.)

Inclosure 25 in No. 17.

Captain de Vere Hunt to Government of India.

Bushire, August 6, 1903.

IN continuation of my letter, dated the 23rd ultimo, regarding the reappearance of the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman in the vicinity of Katif, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, copy of a letter which I have received from the Assistant Political Agent, Bahrein, on the subject.

Inclosure 26 in No. 17.

Mr. Gaskin to Captain de Vere Hunt.

Bahrein, August 4, 1903.

IN continuation of my letter dated the 19th July, 1903, I have the honour to forward, for your information, a translation of a letter I have received from Sayyid Taleb Pasha, Mutessarif of Al-Hassa, on the subject of the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman.

It would seem from the Mutessarif's letter that the pirate had left the district when he was sought after by the Turks, and has gone towards Koweit; but I may state that the Kaïmakam and the Mutessarif's messenger have been misled, as Ahmed was at Annich near Katif at the time, and he was subsequently seen at Saihat, and, lastly, I hardly think that he would go to Koweit territory. Of course, it is quite possible that it may have been hinted to the pirate to leave the district and go in hiding with some tribe under Sheikh Mubarak; and with a view to warn Sheikh Mubarak, and, if possible, to effect the capture of the pirate, a letter may be addressed to him on the subject, and request him to have the man seized and sent for trial to Bahrein, where ample evidence can be produced against him. The man is a native of Bahrein, and a cousin of Sheikh Isa, so there can be no objection to such a course being taken.

Inclosure 27 in No. 17.

Sayyid Taleb Pasha to Mr. Gaskin.

(Translation.)

20 Rabi-ul-Thani, 1321 (July 16, 1903).

I HAD, ere this, replied to you by letter about the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman and his companions, whom you asked me to imprison.

I gave distinct orders to the agent of the Kaïmakam of Katif to make inquiries with a view to his pursuing and capturing him. I sent this letter with one of my men in whom I have confidence, and he, in company with the Kaïmakam and the Commandant of the forces, Muhammad Ali Effendi, went to the house of Nasir-bin-Mubarak and his neighbours, the Beni Hajir, and made a secret search, giving out that they were searching for deserted soldiers. They, however, did not find him, and my messenger returned to me with a reply from the Kaïmakam, stating that, according to authentic reports, the man had left some days ago towards Koweit along with his cousins, and they have been unable to capture them. I have strictly enjoined him not to neglect this matter, and on receiving news of their return towards Katif, he should pursue and capture

them, and inform me of the result at once. You may rest assured that whenever he returns he will be captured. Besides this, you may detail men to ascertain his whereabouts and inform me, when I shall carry out your wishes.

If you have any important work at Katif, please refer it direct to the Kaïmakam. I have given him distinct orders to take the necessary action which may be in accordance with the laws and Government rules.

Inclosure 28 in No. 17.

Captain de Vere Hunt to Government of India.

Bushire, August 27, 1903.

IN continuation of my letter dated the 6th instant, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, copy of the letter which I have received from His Britannic Majesty's Acting Consul, Bussorah, regarding the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman.

Inclosure 29 in No. 17.

Acting Consul Crow to Captain de Vere Hunt.

Bussorah, August 17, 1903.

WITH reference to your endorsement of the 6th August and your telegrams of the 12th and 16th August, I have the honour to inform you that the Vali has communicated to me a letter which he has received from the Mutessarif of Hassa in reply to his inquiries about Ahmed-bin-Selman. The Mutessarif states that the pirate has gone in the direction of Koweit, that the search and pursuit after him are being continued, and that there will be no further chance of his doing mischief. If he returns he will be arrested, and his trial by default before the Court of Cassation in Nejd is proceeding. As requested by your telegram of the 16th August, I have to-day informed the Vali that, according to your information, he is still in the district of Katif, and bent on mischief, and I have asked his Excellency to direct the Mutessarif to arrest him at the first opportunity.

Inclosure 30 in No. 17.

Captain de Vere Hunt to Government of India.

Bushire, August 27, 1903.

IN continuation of my letter dated the 27th instant, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of the letter which I have received from the Assistant Political Agent, Bahrein, regarding an attempt made by the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman to seize a boat below Damam near Katif.

Inclosure 31 in No. 17.

Mr. Gaskin to Captain de Vere Hunt.

Bahrein, August 22, 1903.

IN continuation of my letter dated the 15th August, I have the honour to report that the Chief of Bahrein sent me to-day a man named Abdulla-al-Attaibi, whose boat Ahmed-bin-Selman attempted to seize on the 15th instant below Damam near Katif. A translation of Abdulla's statement recorded in my office is forwarded for your information.

There is no doubt in my mind that Ahmed never left Katif territory, and that the story about his having gone towards Koweit was fabricated either by the Arabs with a deliberate view to mislead the Turkish authorities and stop their search after Ahmed, or by the Kaïmakam to clear himself from blame for failing to seize him.

[1516]

H

I am sending copies of Abdulla's statement to the Kaïmakam of Katif and the Mutesarif of Al-Hassa with a request that further efforts may be made for the capture of the pirate.

Inclosure 32 in No. 17.

Statement of Abdulla-al-Attaibi, a resident of Beddia in Bahrein, recorded on August 22, 1903.

BY order of Sheikh Isa he took two Beni Hajir tribesmen named Nimir and Awitha, and a riding camel returned by the Sheikh in his boat to Thahran. On Saturday (the 15th August) he left at Beddia and reached a place below Damam that afternoon where his passengers disembarked, and directly the latter got away, Ahmed-bin-Selman and three Beni Hajir tribesmen boarded his boat, and they attempted to take the boat after threatening them, but, owing to having a Beni Hajir companion with him in the boat, the three other pirates insisted upon Ahmed to withdraw, and they left the boat, and were subsequently followed by Ahmed. He declared on oath that Ahmed-bin-Selman, who is personally known to him, was one of the pirates who boarded his boat. Owing to southerly winds blowing at the time he remained off Damam, and the wind changing to the north on Thursday (the 20th instant), he returned to Al-Beddia.

Inclosure 33 in No. 17.

Extract from the Diary of the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf for the Week ending August 6, 1904.

Bahrein.

15. July 28, 1904.—The Chief of Bahrein sent a message to the Assistant Political Agent to the effect that one of his Bedouin spies reports that he saw Ahmed-bin-Selman, the pirate, with a number of companions, at Safwa, on the 26th instant, on the look-out for a boat in which to take to sea.

Inclosure 34 in No. 17.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, August 27, 1904.

IN continuation of the correspondence ending with Foreign Department telegram dated the 17th August, 1904, I have the honour to forward a copy of letter of 20th instant from the Assistant Political Agent, Bahrein.

A copy has also been forwarded to His Britannic Majesty's Consul, Bussorah, whose views have been asked as to whether His Majesty's ship "Merlin," now at Bussorah, can be spared to go in search of the pirate.

The course followed by Sheikh Jassim-bin-'Thani is of some interest.

Inclosure 35 in No. 17.

Mr. Gaskin to Major Cox.

Bahrein, August 20, 1904.

IN continuation of my letter dated the 7th August, 1904, I have the honour to report that the Chief of Bahrein this morning sent for my perusal a letter dated the 9th instant, from Sheikh Jassim-bin-Thani, introducing to him the victims of the piracy mentioned in paragraph 340 of this office diary, dated the 13th instant, and requesting him to move in the matter with the view to prevail upon the Turks to restore the stolen property and punish the perpetrators of the crime.

The Chief states that since the British Government prohibit the Arab Chiefs sending out armed boats to patrol the sea against pirates, the Chiefs conform to the policy and rely upon the British Government to employ their good offices when occasion arises, and for this reason Sheikh Jassim invokes our assistance rather than apply direct to the Turks. I think that this instance goes to show that it is Sheikh Jassim's desire to cut himself adrift from the Turks, and not knowing how we should take a direct application for help he makes it through Sheikh Isa.

Saeed and Ali, sons of Mohamed-el-Mehanedi, the victims, state that they left Khor Shagig on the 7th instant, taking with them cash to the amount of 2,467 rs. 8 a. in rupees, dollars, and Turkish liras and 780 rupees' worth of pearls to meet some debts in Bahrein and make purchases; that when on Fasht-el-Debil off Ras Rakan they dropped anchor awaiting a favourable wind to take them to Bahrein, and while they were asleep at noon that day the pirate, Ahmed-bin-Selman, with fourteen companions, boarded them and towed them to Howar Island, where the pirates relieved them of everything they possessed and allowed them to go, and that they proceeded to Lusail and reported the matter to Sheikh Jassim. They declare that what was taken from them was all they possessed in the world, and that they are indebted to British and Bahrein subjects.

I have sent copies of these men's statements to the Acting Mutesarif of Al-Hassa and the Kaïmakam of Katif, giving the indebtedness of the men to British and Bahrein subjects as my reason, and expressed a hope that measures will be taken for the apprehension of the culprits.

I beg to inclose a statement of the property plundered by Ahmed-bin-Selman and his companions, and venture to request that the case may be brought to the notice of his Excellency the Wali of Bussorah, who at the same time may be pressed to do what is necessary in the matter.

Inclosure 36 in No. 17.

STATEMENT of the Property plundered from Saeed and Ali, sons of Mahomed-el-Mehanedi, by Ahmed-bin-Selman and his gang, on August 7, 1904.

Description.				Amount.		
				Rs.	a.	p.
Cash rupees	1,300	0	0
750 dollars, at 137 per cent.	1,027	8	0
10 Turkish liras, at 14	140	0	0
Pearls		2,467	8 0
2 rifles		780	0 0
Clothes		150	8 0
1 gold ring		100	0 0
1 soil		24	0 0
1 small boat		40	0 0
					80	0 0
Total		3,642	0 0

(Signed)

J. C. GASKIN,

Assistant Political Agent.

Bahrein, August 20, 1904.

Inclosure 37 in No. 17.

Extracts from the Diaries of the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf for the Week ending August 20 and September 3, 1904.

Week ending August 20, 1904.

Bahrain.

12. August 6, 1904.—One Syed Selman arrived this evening from Katif to warn the Chief that the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman seized his boat with its crew at Safwa, near Katif, and proceeded to sea.

14. August 12, 1904.—It is reported by the Chief of Bahrain that the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman has plundered 2,380 rupees from a boat belonging to Saeed-bin-Mohamed-el-Mehamedi of Khor Shagig in Katr on the 8th instant off Ras Rakan. Consul, Bussorah, informed.

Week ending September 3, 1904.

Bahrain.

20. August 24, 1904.—It is reported by the Chief that the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman has plundered a Persian sailing boat crossing with melons from the Persian coast.

No. 18.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 9.)

Sir,

India Office, January 7, 1905.

WITH reference to Mr. Villiers' letter of the 17th August and to Sir E. Gorst's letter of the 29th November, 1904, regarding the proposal to erect flag-staffs in the neighbourhood of Cape Musandim, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to forward, to be laid before the Marquess of Lansdowne, copy of correspondence with the Admiralty, and of a telegram to the Viceroy, on the subject.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure 1 in No. 18.

India Office to Admiralty.

Sir,

India Office, January 7, 1905.

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for India to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23rd December on the subject of the flags to be hoisted in the neighbourhood of Cape Musandim.

As regards the request of the Lords Commissioners for more precise information as to the object of erecting the flag-staffs and the proposed hoisting of a British flag, and with reference to the statement that the policy which dictated the ear-marking of the places in question has been formulated without reference to Admiralty opinion, I am directed to refer you to the Secret letter from the Government of India of the 23rd October, 1902, and the Minute of the Viceroy inclosed therewith, which discussed exhaustively the question of policy involved. That letter was communicated to the

Foreign Office, by whom the Secretary of State was informed, in a letter of the 17th February, 1903, that the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty had no objection to the proposal of the Government of India to reoccupy the old telegraph station at Elphinstone Inlet, and that Lord Lansdowne concurred in the proposal. The Government of India were accordingly informed that the proposal was approved, and in their Secret letter of the 21st January, 1904, they recommended the erection of the flag-staffs and the hoisting of the flags now in question as the best means of reoccupying the old telegraph station. The letter of the Government of India was forwarded for the consideration of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty with my letter of the 24th February, 1904, which also inclosed a copy of a letter to the Foreign Office of the same date on the subject. On the 8th August, 1904, in a further letter to the Foreign Office, of which a copy was sent to the Admiralty, with a letter of the same date, Mr. Brodrick inquired whether, in Lord Lansdowne's opinion, there was any objection to authority being given to the Government of India to carry out their proposal to erect the flag-staffs. On the 17th August Mr. Brodrick was informed by the Foreign Office that Lord Lansdowne saw no objection, and the Government of India was accordingly informed, by a telegram of the 24th August, that the erection of the flag-staffs was approved.

Mr. Brodrick regrets that the views of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty were not made known to him at an earlier date. He proposes now to bring the whole question before the Defence Committee. Pending their decision upon it, he has informed the Government of India of the objections expressed in your letter, and has instructed them to take no further action in the matter for the present. But, before coming to a final decision, he would be glad to be favoured with the views of the Lords Commissioners as to the best means of carrying out the policy of the reoccupation of the old telegraph station at Elphinstone Inlet, in order to prevent the acquisition by any foreign Power of a commanding position at the entrance to the Persian Gulf. It appears, from the Foreign Office letter of the 17th February, 1903, referred to in the second paragraph of this letter, that the Lords Commissioners have no objection to this policy in itself.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure 2 in No. 18.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Secret.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, December 30, 1904.

YOUR telegram of the 8th ultimo.

Objection is now taken by Admiralty, on naval grounds, to the hoisting of flags on Musandim, in view of the fact that the navy will be called upon to defend the honour of the flag in the event of complications arising. Admiralty view is that, unless we are prepared to claim the places in question as British territory, the mere hoisting either of the Union Jack or the Blue Ensign will not prevent foreign nations from occupying the places jointly with ourselves, if they choose to hoist their flag alongside ours. Please suspend all further action in connection with hoisting of flags, pending result of reference which is being made to Defence Committee on the whole question. Admiralty have been asked for their views as to the best means of giving effect to the policy proposed in your letter dated the 23rd October, 1902, which was approved in consultation with them.

No. 19.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 9.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Resident, Aden, dated the 8th January, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, January 9, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 19.

Resident, Aden, to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

ADEN delimitation.

FitzMaurice telegraphs as follows:—

Aden, January 8, 1905.

"With reference to the telegram of the 3rd January from the Secretary of State for India to the Viceroy, I am informed by the Turkish Commissioner that the instructions have not yet reached him. In spite of obscure wording of instructions, they would apparently enable settlement of line to Murad to be arrived at. Reference to delimitation of the Subaihi border by a line running from Kuddam, in the note from the Turkish Ambassador, appears to be an admission of the greatest importance, and I would suggest we might hold the Turkish Government to it (1) in order that we may compel them to withdraw the objectionable restriction which they wish to impose, whereby British troops are to be prohibited from visiting the nine cantons, a term which covers Dthala, and even, according to the Turkish interpretation, Aden itself, and (2) in order that, as proposed in the telegram from the Viceroy to the Secretary of State for India, dated the 14th July, 1904, specific reversion of territory up to Akama and Akkar and Kuddam may be secured by us, instead of the vague promise that the territory shall not be ceded to a third Power, coupled with the condition that the territory outside the line to Murad shall 'remain in the vilayet of Yemen.' Subject to approval, I would therefore recommend proposing to the Turkish Commissioner the line of the watershed from Numan to Nojan; thence to Uzzan (*vide* paragraph 9 of Memorandum which formed inclosure of letter from the Commission dated the 4th June, 1904), and from Uzzan by Kuddam, Umari, Kuwab, and Murad. This line would leave to the Turks the strip of sea coast with Dabab village, also the telegraph, road, and the wells which they require (see half-inch survey map). I should be glad to be informed if this proposal is approved.

"With regard to the delimitation north-eastward to the desert, Sultan's decision on this point appears to be that which was contained in the telegram sent me by the Embassy at Constantinople on the 5th November last. It would, perhaps, be well, for the reason given in my telegram of the 6th November last, not to leave the Turkish contention unanswered."

(Repeated to Viceroy.)

No. 20.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 3.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, January 9, 1905.

WITH reference to your telegram No. 4 of the 6th instant, on the subject of the Aden frontier, the stipulation that neither Power shall send troops into the nine Cantons is quite inadmissible, and you should press for compliance with our original demand, including the recognition of the north-east frontier. You should explain to the Porte that the line which the Turkish Ambassador described to me in his communication of the 30th ultimo, is obviously founded on a misconception of geographical details, as territory would be included within the Aden Cantons, to which His Majesty's Government are willing, provided it shall be ceded to no other Power, to waive their claim.

No. 21.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to M. Cambon.

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 11, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's note of the 6th instant relative to the Muscat Arbitration.

His Majesty's Government have great pleasure in agreeing to M. Delcassé's suggestion that the fortnight's delay in the assembling of the Tribunal, which will be

necessary in order that Chief Justice Fuller may reach The Hague without undue haste, should be provided by postponing the date for the delivery of the Cases until the 1st February.

As regards the choice of an Umpire, it would seem to be sufficient that the two Governments should request the Arbitrators selected by them to concert with each other on the subject, and, if the Government of the French Republic see no objection, His Majesty's Government will ask the Chief Justice of the United States to communicate accordingly with M. Savornin Lohman.

His Majesty's Government are inclined to think that formal record of the postponement agreed upon would be most conveniently made by means of an exchange of notes, and I should be obliged if your Excellency would be good enough to ascertain whether this course is approved by the Government of the French Republic.

I have, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 22.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 17.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 11, 1905.

THE Turkish Ambassador to-day renewed his complaints as to Captain Knox's proceedings at Koweit, and as to the alleged landing at Bussorah of British officers said to be on their way to Nejd for the purpose of giving encouragement to the rebellion of Ibn Saud. I told his Excellency that I had not yet received a full account of Captain Knox's proceedings at Koweit, or as to the alleged landing of the British officers at Bussorah; but that I was able to inform his Excellency distinctly that His Majesty's Government had no idea of interfering in the internal affairs of Arabia or of sending Agents to take part in the rivalries of local Chiefs. I added that in view of the manner in which the Turkish Government was treating us in regard to the Aden Iradé, I could not help feeling surprised that his Excellency should come to me with such trivial complaints.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 23.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 12.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 30th December, 1904, relative to the Muscat Arbitration.

India Office, January 11, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 23.

Mr. Brodrick to the Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, December 30, 1904.

MUSCAT Arbitration. Your telegram of the 28th October last. It is proposed by French Government that list of flag-holders should be included in the Memorandum to be sent in by them to the Tribunal.

32

No. 24.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Musurus Pasha.

My dear Ambassador,

Foreign Office, January 13, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge, with thanks, the receipt of your letter of the 5th instant, forwarding the extract from the "Times" relative to an alleged British policy of expansion in Arabia, to which you had drawn my attention on the previous day. I observe that the extract in question summarises an article which appeared in a French newspaper, the "Petit Parisien."

I can only state that the idea that either His Majesty's Government or the Egyptian Government contemplate the establishment of a British Protectorate in the interior of Arabia appears to me so preposterous as to be unworthy of attention. It would be entirely inconsistent with the whole tendency of British policy, and I find it difficult to believe that His Majesty the Sultan can attach serious importance to such idle rumours.

I have, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 25.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir F. Bertie.

(No. 31 A.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 13, 1905.

I SIGNED with the French Ambassador to-day an Agreement, of which a copy is inclosed,* supplementary to that already signed on the 13th October last, in regard to the Muscat Arbitration.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 26.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 14.)

Sir,

India Office, January 12, 1905.

WITH reference to your letter of the 21st November, 1900, on the question of protection being afforded by His Majesty's Consuls in Persia to natives of Koweit, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to transmit, for Lord Lansdowne's consideration, a copy of a letter from the Government of India advocating a reconsideration of the position taken up by His Majesty's Government in your letter above referred to.

It appears to Mr. Brodrick that, though natives of Koweit cannot be regarded as British-protected persons, or be justiciable by the British Consular Tribunals in Persia, it is for consideration whether we should claim for them in Persia the same privileges as have been conceded to Afghans in Persia, viz., that "the friendly recommendations and wishes of the British Government" on their behalf "should be accepted." Should this principle be recognized by the Persian Government, the question of a claim to compensation being made in particular cases on behalf of aggrieved natives of Koweit might then be considered.

With regard to the question of the flag, raised in the 7th paragraph of the Government of India letter, Mr. Brodrick will be glad to be favoured with Lord Lansdowne's views. The present proposal appears to Mr. Brodrick to be distinct from that which was negatived by Lord Lansdowne in your letter of the 24th September, 1901.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

* Printed separately.

33

Inclosure 1 in No. 26.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Secret.)

Sir,

Fort William, December 8, 1904.

WE have the honour to address you regarding our relations with Koweit, with special reference to the question of the protection which His Majesty's Government are prepared to grant to subjects of the Sheikh in Persian territory.

2. The question is one which has been brought into prominence by the action of the Customs Department of the Persian Government, whose officious activity has recently produced a series of incidents which have roused a strong popular feeling at Koweit, and appear to be dictated by a deliberate policy to destroy our prestige and influence with the Arabs of the western shore of the Gulf. The details of these occurrences are narrated in the inclosures of this despatch, and their principal features may be briefly stated:—

(a.) In April 1904 M. Dambrain, then Director-General of Customs at Bushire, while cruising in the "Muzaffari," overhauled a Koweit dhow which he apparently suspected of carrying arms. The vessel, which was stopped out of sight of land, was taken to Lingah, where her cargo was found on examination to be innocent. She was detained, however, for some days, and was not finally released until her master had been fined a sum of 25 tomans for an alleged technical breach of Customs Regulations.

(b.) In June, one Mubarak-bin-Khalifa was detained with his vessel for eight days at Sheirah and twenty-one days at Lingah on suspicion of an alleged offence against the Customs. Pending an investigation of the charge, he was required to surrender as security a part of his cargo, and eventually, rather than incur further delay, abandoned this portion of his freight, and left with his vessel for Koweit.

(c.) In the same month a vessel of Sheikh Mubarak's, the "Mussalim," sailing between Koweit and Fao with a cargo of wood and dates, was fired on and held up for search by Belgian Customs officials in the Shat-el-Arab.

(d.) In September a Koweit vessel, the "Teyser," bound for Bussorah, was seized in the Shat-el-Arab by the Customs ship "Muzaffari," and was only released on payment of a fine of twice the value of each of twelve rifles, which were declared by the master to be carried for purposes of defence against pirates, a statement which was not improbably true.

(e.) In June a Koweit subject, employed by the British India Steam Navigation Company as a pilot for their mail steamers, was accused of having committed an assault on a negro at Bushire. The Political Resident wished to use his good offices on behalf of the accused, but the Turkish Consular Agent claimed to defend him on the ground that he was a Turkish subject. The matter was referred to Tehran, where Sir Arthur Hardinge arranged that the case should be removed to the Court of the Foreign Office Agent or Karguzar, so as to allow of a representative of the British Consulate-General attending at the trial. In agreeing to this course, however, the Persian Government expressly intimated that their consent was based on the British nationality of the Arab's employment, and abstained from committing themselves to an acceptance of either the British or Turkish view as to the international status of Koweit. Mention of this incident has been added, as the issue involved is the same, though the case is of a somewhat different character to those preceding, and we do not propose any further action in regard to it.

3. The present is not the first occasion on which the question of the status of Koweit subjects has come under review. The point was raised in 1900 in connection with the importation of certain arms into Persia by a merchant said to be a subject of the Sheikh. Our Political Resident in the Persian Gulf was then informed by Lord Lansdowne that Koweit was not under formal British protection, though we had promised the Sheikh our good offices; that natives of Koweit could not be claimed as British-protected persons, nor would they be justiciable by British Consular Tribunals in Persia. It was added that interference to protect any Koweit subject was undesirable, and that action on the part of the Resident was unnecessary until he was appealed to, but that endeavours should be made to ascertain the facts as to the man's nationality and the Sheikh's wishes as to resisting Turkish claims to jurisdiction over him.

[1516]

K

4. In the recent cases we are left in no doubt as to the nationality of the affected parties or as to the wishes of Sheikh Mubarak, who has requested our assistance in formal and strongly worded communications addressed to our Political Agent at Koweit. We have not overlooked the fact that His Majesty's Government have intimated that they are not prepared to declare a formal Protectorate over the Sheikh's territories, and have even admitted that Koweit is within the Turkish Empire. The latter pronouncement, however, was accompanied by the important qualification that the authority of the Sublime Porte is of an entirely unsubstantial character, and that, in fact, the Chief enjoys a large measure of practical independence. By his engagement of the 23rd January, 1899, the Sheikh virtually placed the conduct of his external relations in our hands, and he now naturally looks to the British Government to assist his subjects when in trouble with officials of the Persian Government. In 1902 he was formally assured of British protection against an attack on Koweit, and he has repeatedly been informed that His Majesty's Government will lend him their good offices so long as he adheres to their advice. The visit of his Excellency Lord Curzon, in December 1903, was regarded as a further declaration of our intention to protect and befriend him, while the recent appointment of a British Agent to reside at Koweit, or, as we now understand from your recent telegrams, to pay periodical visits to Koweit, has led the Sheikh and his subjects to expect a larger measure of support than they have hitherto received. We feel strongly that it is incumbent upon us to assist him to the utmost of our powers, and that failure to do so must lead not only to a complete loss of the influence which we have acquired over the Sheikh, who plainly warns us that he will be obliged to seek other relief if we are unable to put a stop to Persian tyranny over his seafaring subjects, but also to a serious decline of our prestige throughout both the Arabian and Persian coasts of the Gulf. The prospect of the latter result is one which, in view of the evident designs of other Powers in these regions, we could not regard with equanimity.

5. The repudiation of Turkish pretensions to treat as subjects of the Sublime Porte natives of Koweit territory is no new thing. In 1902, in connection with the "Lapwing" incident, His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah directly challenged a claim to this effect preferred by the Wali of Bussorah. But fortunately, in connection with the present cases, it is unnecessary to raise this issue with the Turkish authorities, or to take any action which need bring us into direct conflict with the Porte at a moment when we understand His Majesty's Government are anxious to avoid complications in that quarter. All that is required is that we should arrive at an understanding with the Persian Government as to the status of subjects of the Sheikh within the dominions of the Shah, but this is a point as to which we hold that our relations with the Sheikh and his direct demand for our protection no longer permit the attitude of the British Government to remain undefined. So far, it will be observed from the correspondence, of which we have the honour to inclose copies, the local officials of the Persian Customs Department have declined to admit the right of our Representatives to intervene on behalf of Koweit subjects. We suggest that His Majesty's Minister at Tehran should now be authorized to explain to the Persian Government that we claim recognition of Koweitians as British-protected persons. Should the Shah's Ministers question our pretension, they might be informed of the terms of our Agreement concluded with the Sheikh in 1899, and it might be pointed out that our right to intervene, by virtue of similar Treaties, on behalf of subjects of the Trucial Chiefs has already been recognized and acted upon. At the least, it might be required that Koweitians should be entitled to the same privileges as Afghan subjects in Persia, on whose behalf it has been arranged that "the friendly recommendations and wishes of the British Government should be accepted."

6. As regards the specific incidents which have made it necessary to raise the general question, we consider that in cases (a) and (b), in the absence of satisfactory explanation by the Customs Department, there is good ground for a claim to compensation; in respect of (c), we think that the Sheikh is clearly entitled to an apology; while as regards (d), without entering into the question of the doubtful claim of the Persian Government to exercise a right of search on the waters of the Shat-el-Arab—against this we understand that the Porte have already entered a protest at Tehran—we hold that, in the particular instance, their action was entirely unjustified, inasmuch as the vessel in question was bound not for a Persian, but for a Turkish port, while the confiscated arms may reasonably be taken to have been required for purposes of self-protection. The insecurity of the Shat-el-Arab is notorious; we have recently had occasion to urge that representations should be made

to the Persian Government regarding a grave outrage on a British vessel in the estuary; and we understand that the Persian Government have themselves lately admitted the propriety of native craft carrying arms in these waters. In this case also, therefore, we would press for pecuniary amends. The Persian Government may rest assured of our anxiety to check the traffic in arms, but, even assuming that their proceedings were directed solely to the repression of illicit trade, and were in no way inspired by a desire to harass a protégé of the British Government, we are unable to countenance high-handed action, such as that of the Persian Customs officials in the present instance. We have purposely abstained from mention of the further case in which a vessel sailing from Koweit was admittedly found to have concealed on board twenty-eight rifles, in respect of which suspicions may reasonably exist that they were contraband, whether intended for a Turkish or Persian destination.

7. It will be observed that, in connection with this subject, Major Cox has raised the question of the flag flown by Koweit vessels. The matter was considered in 1901, and it was then decided that, in view of the objections which the Sublime Porte might raise to any change as involving a disturbance of the *status quo*, it was preferable to abstain from advising the adoption of another flag. We agree with the Resident, however, that there would be a distinct advantage if Koweit ships hoisted a distinctive ensign, and, with the approval of His Majesty's Government, we would propose to approach the Sheikh on the subject. Should the Sheikh agree to the proposal, and should the Porte hereafter raise objections, we would point out that we have an agreement with the Chief whereby we are entitled to search Koweit craft for contraband arms, and that being desirous of avoiding any risk of detaining a Turkish ship by mistake for a Koweit vessel—a very possible contingency if both fly the same flag—we had recommended the Sheikh to adopt distinctive colours for shipping purposes, while retaining his present flag for use in Koweit.

8. We are forwarding a copy of this despatch direct to His Majesty's Minister at Tehran.

We have, &c.
(Signed) AMPHILL.
E. FG. LAW.
E. R. ELLES.
A. T. ARUNDEL.
H. ERLE RICHARDS.
J. P. HEWETT.

Inclosure 2 in No. 26.

Major Cox to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, June 30, 1904.

A PERSIAN subject has brought a charge of causing him hurt against a Koweit Arab who is in the permanent paid employ of the British India Steam Navigation Company as pilot for steamers carrying His Majesty's mails. Both on grounds of his employment and his alien nationality, I wish to give the Arab the good offices of this Consulate to the extent of sending a representative to be present at the trial in order to see that no injustice is done, as there is reason to expect. My suggestion is acquiesced in by the Foreign Office Agent, but he said that, owing to the Governor's misrepresentation, case is complicated by Turkish Consular Agent, who claims to protect the Arab as a Turkish subject. Both the Governor and I have declined to recognize this claim. The case could probably be settled with dispatch if your Excellency would move the Mushir-ed-Dowleh to instruct the Foreign Office Agent to dispose of it, and admit the Resident's representative at the trial. He says that he is quite ready to do so. Meanwhile, the Arab will, with concurrence of local authorities, remain in my custody.

(Addressed to Sir A. Hardinge.)

Inclosure 3 in No. 26.

Government of India to Major Cox.

(Telegraphic.)

PLEASE refer to your telegram of the 30th June. The Turks claim to protect the Koweit Arab. Please send by post the reply received from Sir A. Hardinge. (Repeated to His Majesty's Minister at Tehran.)

Simla, July 9, 1904.

Inclosure 4 in No. 26.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, July 3, 1904.

IN continuation of my telegram of the 30th June, repeating a message sent by me to His Majesty's Minister, Tehran, on the subject of good offices which it was desired to extend to a Koweit Arab in the employ of the British India Company as mail pilot, I have the honour to append for information a paraphrase of his Excellency's reply.

Inclosure 5 in No. 26.

Sir A. Hardinge to Major Cox.

(Telegraphic.)

YOUR telegram of the 30th June. In reply to a message from me yesterday, Mushir-ed-Dowleh has promised to obtain the Shah's authority to issue instructions in the sense which you desire, as he agrees that the British nationality of the Arab's employment enable the Persian Government to comply, without committing themselves either to British or Turkish views regarding the status of Koweit.

Tehran, July 2, 1904.

Inclosure 6 in No. 26.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, July 2, 1904.

CERTAIN cases have recently occurred in which the Nacodas of Koweit dhows appear to have been needlessly oppressed by Belgian Customs officials, and the Residency Agent at Lingah asks to be informed definitely as to what amount of protection he is entitled to afford them.

2. In one case the late Director-General of Bushire Customs, M. Dambrain, while cruising in the "Muzafferi" last April, overhauled a Koweit dhow at sea, between Hindarabi and Kais Island, in the hopes of finding arms in her. Being unable to search her at sea, he towed her into Lingah, where he had her cargo taken out and detained her several days. Finding her cargo innocent (it consisted of wooden rafters from Kishm), he allowed it to be put back, but (as if to show that his action was justified) he found the Nacoda guilty of neglecting some technical detail of Customs Regulations and fined him 25 tomans.

The Nacoda went straight back to Koweit and complained to Sheikh Mubarek that in the first place he had been seized on the high seas out of sight of land, and that, secondly, though his cargo was innocent and he had not intentionally committed any breach of rules, he had been delayed for several days and eventually fined 25 tomans.

The Director-General was approached informally by my predecessor, and the process was repeated by me without any satisfactory result.

3. A second complaint has now been received from the Residency Agent at Lingah, giving details of another case, in which he alleges that a Koweit dhow, with a certificate from Sheikh Mubarek to say that the dhow and cargo were Koweit owned, has been mulcted of twenty bags of wheat and has been detained several days. This case is still under correspondence.

4. It is not, however, with regard to individual cases or the details of them that I have thought it necessary to trouble Government. My object is to invite the consideration of the Government of India to the general question of the extent to which protection or good offices can now be afforded to subjects of the Sheikh of Koweit when in difficulties of the kind above explained.

It is evident to me that if we wish to maintain our influence with Sheikh Mubarek, much less to strengthen it, we must accept some responsibility to see ordinary justice meted out to his subjects in places where we have Agents, as far as lies in our power. I am also inclined to deduce from one or two local incidents that there is some tendency on the part of local officials, possibly prompted from outside, to make a special set against Koweit subjects at the present time.

With an Agent at Koweit, and in view of Sheikh Mubarek's energetic entreaties, we shall henceforward be in a stronger position to use our influence in the direction desired; and, while on this subject, I venture to inquire whether we might not now press the Sheikh to adopt a distinctive device for his flag, which would enable the vessels of his subjects to be identified.

At present the fact that Koweit dhows fly the Turkish flag unaltered in any way makes it easy for Customs officials to ignore their Koweit origin, and encourages Turkish Consular representatives who wish to obtrude their expensive protection.

Inclosure 7 in No. 26.

Sheikh Mubarek to Resident.

(Translation.)

(Extract.)

March 31, 1904.

AFTER giving details of the seizure and detention of a Koweit dhow:—

"And we will not endure this treatment, and your sense of honour will not permit that those who are under your protection shall be treated in such a way.

"Therefore have I made this appeal to you.

"And in this connection, when we see that we get protection from you, we shall feel honoured, and so will our subjects. And such treatment is hoped for and is an attribute of your glorious Government.

"If, on the other hand, you take no notice of this and such tyranny over our subjects who ply their seafaring pursuits is not put a stop to by you, then we shall be obliged to look out for some other condition of affairs which will give us relief from it. The result of it is that all our subjects who travel are in a state of alarm, and all we ask of you is to see that the trade of our seafaring subjects is not brought to a standstill by such treatment, &c.

"Finally, we beg your kind solicitude for the protection of all our subjects in any direction which will honour them and preserve them from tyranny.

"May you be preserved, and salaams."

Inclosure 8 in No. 26.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, August 13, 1904.

IN continuation of my letter, dated the 3rd July, 1904, regarding the Arab pilot, Khalid, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of the marginally noted despatch which I have addressed to His Majesty's Minister at Tehran.

Inclosure 9 in No. 26.

Major Cox to Sir A. Hardinge.

Bushire, August 4, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to refer to the case of the Arab pilot, Khalid, regarding which we have been in telegraphic correspondence.

In his telegram of the 12th July, Mr. Grant Duff informed me that instructions had been sent three days previously to Bushire for the speedy disposal of the case in

the presence of a Residency representative, but it was not till the 14th that orders were received by the Karguzar. He took up the case on the 16th, and admitted my Vice-Consul and Assistant Surgeon Lobo.

The circumstances were found to be that the parties were good friends, dined and got drunk in company, and in the morning the negro found he was wounded. Neither party could remember how it happened.

The wound was a very simple one and was under treatment at our dispensary, and was going on very well, when the man was prevented from coming by the Derya Begi's order, and practically kept in custody by him.

On the negro's appearance at the trial, the wound was examined by a Persian doctor and our Assistant Surgeon, and found to have a plug inside it, so as to aggravate the wound and keep it open!

It was taken out, and the wound is quite healed, and the man completely recovered.

The Karguzar disposed of the case on the 16th, as far as he was concerned, but had to report his conclusions to Tehran. Nearly three weeks have now elapsed, and he has received no orders. The pilot, Khalid, having been in custody at the Residency for five weeks, and the British India Company being in urgent need of his services, I released him on the 21st instant, after taking security and a guarantee from the Company that they would keep him on board their steamers and produce him when required.

Inclosure 10 in No. 26.

Major Cox to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, September 13, 1904.

I HAVE received the following telegram from His Britannic Majesty's Consul at Mohammerah:—

"It is reported that, without referring to the Sheikh at Mohammerah, a Customs steam-ship has arrived at the mouth of the Shat-el-Arab, and is looking for contraband."

He says that he will withdraw the guard and will not be responsible for the safety of the Shat-el-Arab if the boat remains there. If he withdraws the guard, it is probable that robbery will be committed.

(Addressed to Sir A. Hardinge; repeated to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department.)

Inclosure 11 in No. 26.

Major Cox to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, September 18, 1904.

IN continuation of my telegram dated 14th September, Director-General, Customs, in "Persepolis" has now joined "Muzafferi" in Shat-el-Arab, and both are busy. It is important that "Merlin," or other ship, should be sent back as soon as possible.

(Addressed Foreign Department; repeated the Political Agent at Muscat for Senior Naval Officer. Tehran informed.)

Inclosure 12 in No. 26.

Government of India to Sir A. Hardinge.

(Telegraphic.)

September 21, 1904.

PLEASE refer to Major Cox's telegrams dated the 14th and 18th September, 1904, respectively. Under the Agreement of 1902, the Sheikh was to be subordinate to the Ministry of Customs only. The Arabistan Customs were separated from the Gulf Customs. Does not the visit of the Bushire Director in "Persepolis" constitute a direct violation of the Arrangement between the Persian Government and the Sheikh?

We have no information if the Sheikh omitted to lend his boats to the local Customs officers as provided in the Arrangement; but, if he did not, the presence in his jurisdiction of outside Customs vessels appears to require explanation, more especially as his approval is required to the appointment of such officers.
(Repeated to the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf.)

Inclosure 13 in No. 26.

Major Cox to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, September 24, 1904.

MY telegrams of 14th and 18th September.

"Persepolis" and "Muzafferi" returned Bushire yesterday, bringing one Koweit dhow. Am inquiring into reasons for seizure.

Inclosure 14 in No. 26.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, September 27, 1904.

PLEASE refer to your telegram dated the 23rd September.

I have heard on good authority that, on the 24th September, the Director of Customs at Mohammerah submitted the following report to the Ministry of Customs:—

"Having received a report to the effect that a large number of rifles had been shipped from Muscat for Gosbah, which is at the mouth of the Shat-el-Arab, where there is no custom-house, I sent 'Muzafferi' there for a few days simply to seize the arms. Forty-two rifles and nearly 6,000 cartridges have been found and confiscated. 'Muzafferi' left some days ago for Bushire."

He does not mention having applied to the Sheikh for boats. I am having inquiries made at Mohammerah. Two Koweit dhows have been seized, apparently between Gosbah and Fao: one of them, which had fourteen rifles on board, was released on payment of a fine of 800 tomans under protest; the other, which had twenty-eight rifles on board, has been detained at Bushire pending the payment of a fine of 1,200 tomans.

McDouall's good offices have been accepted unofficially, but the Director-General says that he is unable to discuss the matter here as the report has been submitted to Tehran.

(Address to the Legation at Tehran.)

Inclosure 15 in No. 26.

Mr. Grant Duff to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Tehran, September 30, 1904.

PLEASE see your telegram dated the 21st September.

The Director of Customs states that the steamer "Muzafferi" has been sent to confiscate arms at Gosbah. I am pointing out to him that Mohammerah Customs are not under the orders of the Bushire or the Arabistan Customs, and that the dispatch of the steamer without apparently consulting the Sheikh of Mohammerah was unjustifiable and likely to lead to misunderstanding.

The Persian Government do not know that we are aware of their written Agreement with the Sheikh (please see Sir A. Hardinge's despatch No. 167, dated the 5th December, 1902.)

(Addressed to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department, and repeated to the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf.)

Inclosure 16 in No. 26.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, September 30, 1904.

I HAVE addressed the following telegram to His Britannic Majesty's Minister, Tehran:—

"My telegram No. 79 of 27th September.

"His Britannic Majesty's Consul at Mohammerah reports as follows:—

"The Sheikh never refused to lend his steam-boat."

Inclosure 17 in No. 26.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Bushire, September 24, 1904.

IN continuation of my telegrams of the 14th and 19th September, on the subject of the proceedings of the "Persepolis" and "Muzafferi" in the Shat-el-Arab, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, copies of two letters addressed by Mr. Consul McDouall to His Britannic Majesty's Minister at Tehran, reporting the dissatisfaction of the Sardar Arfa with the Customs arrangements in Arabistan, and his objection to the dispatch to the Shat-el-Arab, without his permission, of the Customs steamer "Muzafferi."

Inclosure 18 in No. 26.

Consul McDouall to Sir A. Hardinge.

(Confidential.)

Mohammerah, September 16, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to report that, on the evening of the 11th instant, the Sardar Arfa sent to inform me that his official at Gosbah, at the mouth of the Shat-el-Arab, reported that the Imperial Customs steamer "Muzafferi" was there, and was stopping and searching boats of all kinds, and he was afraid there might be trouble, as he could not be everywhere at once. His Excellency, as the Customs had thus assumed the policing of the river, was very glad to be relieved of that expense, and would remove his patrols in a few days' time if the vessel remained, and inform us officially that he was no longer responsible for the safety of the river which had been assumed by the Customs. Therefore I sent a telegram to Bussorah to be sent to His Majesty's Consul-General at Bushire giving the above facts, and Haji Rais Tujar promised that the patrols should not be removed for a few days to give time for a reply to be received. I have seen the Sardar Arfa twice on this subject. He points out that, although he is supposed to be head of the Customs, the "Muzafferi" has been sent into his jurisdiction without his being informed; secondly, as Governor, he should have been warned in order to take steps to prevent trouble by sending men of his own to be present at the searching of suspected boats. He understands they stop both sea and river boats, and their boats enter the creeks, so that a collision might occur with the tribesmen in the absence of his men. Thirdly, he is warden of the marches (Sarhaddar), and the Shat-el-Arab being the border between Turkey and Persia, complications with Turkey may arise over the actions of the "Muzafferi"; and if the Turkish authorities at Bussorah ask for an explanation, he has none to give. He also reiterated what he had said regarding withdrawing the patrols, and wished His Majesty's Minister to be informed that he might take any action, if advisable.

In the event of his withdrawing the patrols, there is, in my opinion, a likelihood of a recrudescence of piracy in the river. I also believe that interference with the tribesmen, in the absence of the Sardar Arfa's men, is likely to lead to trouble.

Inclosure 19 in No. 26.

Consul McDouall to Sir A. Hardinge.

(Confidential.)

Mohammerah, September 16, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to report that the Sardar Arfa is making certain complaints to the Minister of the Interior at Tehran, of which he wishes you to be informed, but not with a view to asking for support in the matter.

In the Firman given him in connection with the Customs it is distinctly stated that the Directorship-in-chief (Riasat-i-kul) of the Customs of Arabistan is his: that, as there are no capable local men, MM. Waffelaert and Mirzayanty are to be sent to be in charge of the Customs under his Directorship and orders, and his Directorship is under the Ministry of Customs. He undertakes to carry out the orders of the Ministry of Customs, and to lend his private steamers, when required, for preventive service. This Directorship appears to be practically ignored, but whether this is the fault of the local Customs or the Ministry he does not know. Clerks have been appointed without reference to him, and other small matters show that the local Directorate ignore his headship.

Again, the Customs of Arabistan is not under Bushire, as is shown by the Firman above, yet the Bushire administration have sent the "Muzafferi" into the Shat-el-Arab to search for arms and other contraband, and, on the captain reporting that he had arrested two sailing boats with arms, the Bushire Director ordered him to bring them to Bushire. The captain could not do this, so brought them to Mohammerah, and telegraphed to Bushire for the "Persepolis" to come for them.

Some months ago the cashier of the Mohammerah Customs embezzled moneys belonging to the Customs and absconded to Kurrachee, where he was arrested. The Sardar Arfa, at the request of the Customs, issued a warrant to two of his guards to receive the prisoner and bring him to Mohammerah, and his signature and position were authenticated at this Consulate. On this warrant the prisoner was extradited and brought to Mohammerah, and detained at the custom-house. After a preliminary examination, at which the Sardar Arfa was represented, M. Waffelaert being transferred to Bushire, took the prisoner with him, and handed him over to the custody of the authorities at Bushire, although the offence was committed in the jurisdiction of Arabistan. From this it appears that the Customs wish to ignore his position as Governor, as well as that of supreme Director of the Customs of Arabistan, and he considers it necessary to report this to the Central Government.

Inclosure 20 in No. 26.

Extracts from the Diary of the Political Residency in the Persian Gulf for the Week ending September 24, 1904.

Mohammerah.

13. September 13, 1904.—The Customs steamer "Muzafferi" arrived from the mouth of the river with two native boats (bum) in tow, which she had seized on account of having arms on board. One belongs to Koweit, and had twenty-eight rifles and ammunition concealed in the sides of the vessel, and the other, which belongs to the Shat-el-Arab, had twelve rifles.

14. September 14, 1904.—The "Muzafferi" left during the night for the mouth of the river, where she had left her boats. The two boats are under detention pending the arrival of the Persian gun-boat "Persepolis."

Bushire.

23. September 23, 1904.—His Persian Majesty's ship "Persepolis," with the Director-General of Customs on board, accompanied by the Persian revenue steamer "Muzafferi," returned to Bushire. They brought a dhow belonging to Koweit with them.

Inclosure 21 in No. 26.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

Bushire, September 24, 1904.

IN continuation of my letter of to-day's date, on the subject of the proceedings of the Persian gun-boat "Persepolis" and revenue steamer "Muzafferi" in the Shat-el-Arab, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of a communication I have received from the Political Agent, Koweit, together with a copy of a petition from Sheikh Mubarak, regarding the seizure of Koweit boats by the "Muzafferi."

2. The two vessels returned to Bushire yesterday having a dhow in tow. This dhow is believed to be the Koweit dhow captured with twenty-eight rifles on board (*vide* entry No. 13 in my diary for the week ending the 24th September, 1904).

It is reported that another Koweit dhow was seized with ten rifles on board, but was released at Mohammerah on payment of a fine of 8,000 krans.

I am making further inquiries into the matter, and also asking the Director-General of Customs on what grounds these dhows were seized.

Inclosure 22 in No. 26.

Captain Knox to Major Cox.

Koweit, September 14, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a copy (with translation) of a letter received from Sheikh Mubarak, in which he complains of a fresh set of acts of interference with Koweit vessels on the part of the Customs Administration of Persia.

2. I have not had time to verify the allegations, as the letter only reached me yesterday, and Sheikh Mubarak is anxious that you should be acquainted with his complaint without delay.

3. I am afraid, however, that these constant complaints prove a deliberate policy on the part of the Persian Government, of which the object is to destroy our prestige and influence with the Arabs of the western shore of the Gulf. The initiation of this policy was marked by the abortive attempt to occupy Abu Musa and Tamb and, since that failed, the policy has been continued by constant vexations, petty acts of oppression on Arab dhows, especially those hailing from Koweit, and it has now culminated, if I have been correctly informed, in a wanton and unjustifiable insult to an independent Chief under British protection.

4. One of the most oppressive and vexatious forms of this policy is the invariable assumption by the Customs Department that the Arab Nakhoda is in the wrong, and must prove his innocence. I will instance the case of an unfortunate, named Mubarak-bin-Khalifa.

5. This man was detained at Lingah for twenty-one days, having been brought from Sheivah, where he had already been detained eight days for the purpose. Twenty bags of grain were taken from him as security, and he was told to wait and prove his innocence. There is fairly strong evidence that his wheat cargo, for which he was unable to account satisfactorily, was legitimate, and, having come under a pass from the Persian port of Mashur, was, six months later, re-exported from Koweit, but this naturally took time to prove. The case has my attention.

6. Finding his other cargo rotting during his detention, Mubarak made his escape and put out to sea. The Belgians have detained him and some of his crew pending trial for a month, and have confiscated twenty bags of his grain for an offence which there is reason to believe he never committed, and has yet to be proved against him, but for this last heinous offence in disobeying their order to wait and prove his innocence, he is to be persecuted in every Persian port in which he dares to show his face. They have caught him once already, and attached a small boat of his, but could not manage to detain the man himself, who is now in Koweit.

7. It is perhaps unnecessary to call to your remembrance the case, on your office records, of the Koweit boat which, it is alleged, was searched unsuccessfully for arms in the open sea, and then towed into territorial waters and heavily fined for a technical breach of the Customs Regulations.

8. This extraordinary assumption that Arab Nakhodas are bound to prove that they have not committed an offence against the Customs Department can have only one result, where on the one side we have a well-regulated Department, armed with clerks, regulations, and engines of oppression of every description, and on the other ignorant Nakhodas seldom able even to read and write.

9. The feeling in Koweit itself is very bitter against the Belgians, and might at any time lead to acts of retaliation on Persians, and thus the situation would become acute and dangerous.

10. If the Customs Administration persist in this course of conduct, the only remedy that appears to me at all likely to meet the situation is that one of our gun-boats should attend the "Muzafferi" and "Persepolis" wherever they go, especially in the open sea, and whenever they overhaul a boat hailing from the western shores of the Gulf the Commander of the gun-boat should insist on having a clear *prima facie* case against the boat being made out to his satisfaction, or the immediate release of the vessel.

11. The alleged interference with boats bound for Bussorah will no doubt form the subject of a protest from the Turkish local authorities, and I would venture to suggest that His Britannic Majesty's Consul at Bussorah be addressed on the subject.

12. In conclusion, I would crave indulgence for this hastily written preliminary report. The whole subject is under the close and anxious attention of Sheikh Mubarak and myself, and I hope at leisure to submit more fully matured proposals for the solution of the very important difficulties involved therein.

Inclosure 23 in No. 26.

Sheikh Mubarak-us-Subah to Captain Knox.

(Translation.)

(After compliments.)

2nd Rajab, 1322 (September 13, 1904).

WE petition you that the Persian ship, in which are posted Belgians, is now cruising from the buoy to Gushah within the Shat-el-Arab, and seized vessels, and searches them, and delays them on their journeys; that it has seized our boom and bellum which voyage between here and Fao, bringing wood and dates for us, and delayed them some days, and they (the boom and bellum) told them that they were our private boats, and that their work was between Koweit and Fao, bringing wood and dates, and after this vexation they let them go.

And now they have seized a boat of our subjects going to Bussorah from Koweit, and have taken their arms, which all the boats carry for protection from pirates, and this matter is well known to all the Governments.

Every boat carries a small gun for saluting purposes on return to their country and arms, according to the number of the crew in her, as piracy in Bussorah is notorious. Now they have posted soldiers in her, and taken her small-arms, to the number of twelve, and delayed the boat.

And now a letter from the Nakhoda of the boat has reached us, saying that they had seized them at the buoy, and towed the boat into Kasbah in front of the house of the servant of Sheikh Khazal, Ruler of Mohammerah, and they left soldiers in the boat, and kept in custody with him. And may you remain guarded!

Inclosure 24 in No. 26.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

October 3, 1904.

PLEASE refer to your telegram dated the 30th September, regarding Persian ships of war in the Shat-el-Arab.

His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah reports that the Acting Vali has protested, through the Persian Consul-General at Bussorah, to the Persian Government against the gun-boat stopping and searching vessels bound for Bussorah, and that he has telegraphed to the Minister of the Interior on the subject.

(Addressed to His Britannic Majesty's Minister in Tehran, and repeated to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department.)

Inclosure 25 in No. 26.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

Bushire, October 1, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of a letter dated the 23rd September, 1904, from His Majesty's Consul at Mohammerah, on the subject of the proceedings of the Persian revenue steamer "Muzafferi" in the Shat-el-Arab.

2. In reply to a reference from me, M. Waffelaert, Director-General of Customs, states that the "Muzafferi" did, in fact, capture two Koweit dhows, one of which was released on payment (under protest) of a fine of 8,000 krans, and the other of which was brought into Bushire, to be detained till a fine of 18,000 krans is paid. M. Waffelaert added that it was not in his power to discuss the matter further at Bushire, as a report of the capture had already been dispatched to Tehran, presumably from Mohammerah.

3. The position of British Consular officers in Persia with regard to Koweit subjects is at present so undefined that, in view of M. Waffelaert's attitude, it seems unlikely that very much will be effected here.

4. A copy of this communication, with its inclosure, has been sent to His Majesty's Minister, Tehran.

Inclosure 26 in No. 26.

Consul McDouall to Major Cox.

Mohammerah, September 23, 1904.

WITH regard to the seizure of native craft by Customs steam-ship "Muzafferi," I have the honour to report that the owner of a Koweit bum made a complaint to His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah who sent him to me. I have no instructions as to whether Koweit subjects are entitled to more than good offices, and inquired from the Customs authorities if they would accept my intervention on behalf of Koweit subjects.

M. Waffelaert, Acting Director-General, Bushire, informed me that at Bushire, as he had no orders from Tehran to recognize the right of His Majesty's Consulate-General to represent Koweit subjects, there was an understanding that, pending instructions, any action of the Consulate-General should be unofficial, and suggested that the same should be done here, to which I agreed.

M. Waffelaert said that, as it would take some time to settle the case, and reference would have to be made to Tehran to avoid delay to the vessels, he was prepared to accept payment of a fine under protest, the fine to be twice the value of the rifles, estimated at 30 tomans each, and the vessels could then be liberated; when the case had been settled and the amount of fine fixed, if anything to be returned to the owner it would be returned.

The owner of bum accepted this on my advice, and has received a receipt stating that the amount was paid under protest.

The owners are Abdulla-bin-Muhammad and Alwan-bin-Hosein, who state that they bought the vessel two years ago from Abdul Aziz Angri, in whose name the register was issued by Sheikh Mubarak.

The vessel is the bum "Teyser," Nakhoda Ali-bin-Muhammad Mubarak. She was bound from Koweit for Sabiliyat, near Bussorah, to load dates.

The case for the vessel is that they carried 12 rifles and 1,200 cartridges for the defence of the vessel and did not conceal that they had these rifles on board; that they were bound for Sabiliyat in Turkish territory, where their owner is awaiting them, and had no intention of communicating with Persian territory; that the river being the border they were not in Persian waters; that as they were to load dates for sale at the Bedouin villages between Ras-el-Had and Fartag and on, they had brought these arms for protection.

The Customs case is that the rifles were concealed and were new with the full complement of cartridges; that as the importation of arms is prohibited in Turkey as well as Persia, it is of no importance where they were bound. If the vessel can prove that the rifles were not for sale, I am of opinion that twelve rifles are not an

excessive amount, as piracies often occur off the mouth of the Shat-el-Arab, and all vessels therefore should carry sufficient arms to protect themselves; and the Bedouin coast is also unsafe.

A second bum, Nakhoda Ghanim, is also understood to belong to Koweit. She had twenty-eight rifles concealed on board, and this fact is not denied, she had some bundles of hides consigned to Bussorah to which port she was bound. She was captured near the inner buoy, and can only put forward that she was bound for a Turkish port and was not within Persian jurisdiction. This vessel had been taken to Bushire as the owner cannot pay a fine. The fine demanded would come to more than the value of the vessel, and the owner's entire capital was invested in these rifles and the vessel which is mortgaged already.

The "Teyser" proceeds to Sabiliyat where I can communicate with her; she will be there for at least a fortnight. I inclose herewith the deposition of the Nakhoda and, if necessary, he will swear an affidavit in these terms.

The owner states he can get evidence at Koweit that the rifles were purchased for the defence of the vessel only.

If the presence of the owner, Nakhoda, and others is necessary in Bushire to support or prove their claim for a refund of the fine and return of the arms, I would beg to be informed as soon as possible.

Inclosure 27 in No. 26.

Deposition of Ali-bin-Muhammad Mubarak, Nakhoda of the bum "Teyser" of Koweit.

I, ALI-BIN-MUHAMMAD, Nakhoda of the bum "Teyser," state as follows:—

The vessel left Koweit for Sabiliyat to load. On the 10th September, Saturday, was off the Turkish fort at Fao tacking up the river. At midnight two boats from the steam-ship "Muzafferi" came and asked what I had. I said, "Nothing." They then asked if I had any arms. I replied, "Yes; we have twelve rifles for the eighteen men of the crew for the protection of the vessel, two are here and ten below." They then searched the vessel and detained her three days and then brought her to Mohammerah. These arms were bought for the protection of the vessel, as she was bound for Yemen after loading, that is, for the villages beyond Ras-el-Had, and two years ago, having no arms, I was attacked and robbed there.

I solemnly declare, and am prepared to take oath, that the above statement is true in every particular.

(Seal of Ali-bin-Muhammad.)

Deposed and sealed by the said Ali-bin-Muhammad at Mohammerah this 23rd day of September, 1904.

Before me,

(Signed) W. McDouall,
His Britannic Majesty's Consul.

Inclosure 28 in No. 26.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, October 10, 1904.

PLEASE refer to my telegram of the 27th September and letter dated the 1st October regarding the detention here of Koweit dhows pending the payment of 18,000 krans. Under instructions from the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf the Nakhoda has been imprisoned instead of merely being detained. I have requested the Governor to make the man over to me for disciplinary purpose. The Governor has to-day given me an evasive reply, that Director-General of Customs says that the matter does not concern the Governor, and that I should apply to the Customs Department. I had already written demi-officially on the subject to the Director-General without eliciting a reply from him. I would suggest that the British

Minister, Tehran, should be moved by the Government of India to take necessary steps. I should like to be informed whether Koweit subjects should receive benefits from the additional Article of the "Règlement" which fixes the maximum fine at 1,000 rupees.

Inclosure 29 in No. 26.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, October 15, 1904.

IN continuation of previous correspondence ending with my telegram of 10th instant on the subject of the proceedings of the Persian revenue gun-boat "Muzafferi" in the Shat-el-Arab, I have the honour to forward herewith, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of a letter from Captain Knox, Political Agent, Koweit, on the subject of the detention and search of a "boom" belonging to the Sheikh of Koweit.

2. Captain Knox's letter explains the case fully, and it is unnecessary for me to comment on it at length. In regard to the last paragraph, however, I beg to give the following remarks:—

Acting on the complaint of Sheikh Mubarek, sent to me by Captain Knox under cover of his letter dated the 14th September, 1904 (a copy of which was sent to the Government of India with my letter dated the 24th September, 1904), I approached M. Waffelaert on the subject of the alleged seizure of a "boom" and a "bellum" belonging to the Sheikh of Koweit, and received the following reply:—

"As regards the 'boom' and the 'bellum' belonging to the Sheikh of Koweit, I beg to inform you that the 'Muzafferi' has operated searchings in many dhows which she has come across, among which there have, in fact, been a 'boom' and a 'bellum' of which one was coming from Bussorah, and the other going to Maniouhi; from what I have been able to gather from the Commander, none of these (that is of the two mentioned) appertain to the Sheikh of Koweit, as also appears from the one's origin and the other's destination."

I am again addressing the Director-General of Customs in view of the information in Captain Knox's letter, which was unfortunately delayed a week by missing the mail steamer at Fao.

3. I have had the opportunity of conversing with Captain Knox on this subject, and I think that, undoubtedly, popular feeling has been much roused in Koweit by the high-handed proceedings on the part of the Persian Customs Department, and especially by the minute search of a boat belonging to the Sheikh.

4. I trust, therefore, that the Government of India will be pleased to take such action as they think fit to prevent such occurrences in future, and, if necessary, to cause the Customs Department to make some explanation and apology to the Sheikh for the behaviour of their employés on this occasion.

5. A copy of this communication has been sent to His Majesty's Minister, Tehran.

Inclosure 30 in No. 26.

Captain Knox to Major Cox.

Koweit, September 26, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith four statements of the Nakhoda and three sailors of the boom "Musallini," property of Sheikh Mubarek, which, it was alleged, was stopped by the servants of the Imperial Customs Department of Persia on or about the 15th instant.

2. The statements, which were recorded separately, present the usual discrepancies to be found when a number of ignorant witnesses, incapable of correct observation, are examined, but I see no reason to doubt the general truth of their story. Witness No. 2 is obviously unreliable, as it will be an easy matter to prove that the boom reached Fao and did not, as he asserts, return to Koweit at once without being searched.

3. I would venture to suggest that there are two matters on which it is specially necessary to call for an explanation from the Customs Department. The reckless firing of ball cartridge into the air in the direction of Fao at such close quarters as the Shat-el-Arab must be a proceeding attended with considerable risk to person and property. As we have a telegraph station at Fao, and Sheikh Mubarek's followers and employés form, I understand, the bulk of the population of the place, on this score alone, apart from whatever protest the Ottoman local authorities may see fit to present, I venture to think that we should be justified in protesting strongly against the action of the Customs' servants.

4. Further, I would ask that the Customs Department be called on for an explanation as to why Sheikh Mubarek's private boom was searched at all. It is difficult to imagine that a well-known boat like this, always on the run between Koweit and Fao, was not recognized by the crew of the Persian jolly boat, even at a distance; but, even granting this, after the explanation furnished by the crew of the boom, the minute search conducted over Sheikh Mubarek's private boat can only be construed into a deliberate and purposeless insult.

5. I have already explained in my letter, dated the 14th instant, that popular feeling in Koweit is greatly excited over this incident, and I have heard remarks, though not from any responsible quarter, asking why the English, who have been so long in the Gulf, permit such high-handedness on the part of the Persian Government. The report which has recently reached Koweit that an English man-of-war has appeared at the mouth of the Shatt and that the Belgians promptly decamped has been received with undisguised satisfaction.

6. I have only to add that, with reference to Sheikh Mubarek's letter, of which a translation was forwarded under cover of my letter quoted in the preceding paragraph, at an interview I had with Sheikh Mubarek this morning, he informed me that the mention of the bellum was based on incorrect information. The boom only was detained and searched.

STATEMENT No. 1.

Name	Migrin.
Father's name	Ibrahim-bin-Sauad.
Age	30 years.
Occupation	Nakhoda.
Residence	Koweit.

Ten days ago, I left Koweit in the boom "Musallini," property of Sheikh Mubarek. We left at night. We entered the Shatt about 10 A.M. and saw the Belgian boat just before we entered the Fao creek. They were in the jolly boat belonging to the "Muzafferi." All the five men in here were Persians. There was not a single Christian. They shot at the boom four times at about 25 paces distance. They used ball cartridge. I said to them, "This is the boom of Sheikh Mubarek taking the post. Do not shoot." They replied, "We must search your boat." They fired high, through the sail, and no one was hurt, and we have sewn up the holes. They said, "We are searching for arms," and searched the entire boat. When they found nothing, they went away. They kept us waiting for the purposes of their search about an hour, and then let us go. After that day we had no trouble with the Belgians.

Dated Koweit, the 25th September, 1904.

STATEMENT No. 2.

Name	Abdulla.
Father's name	Ahmed.
Age	40 years.
Occupation	Khalassi.
Residence	Koweit, but his family came from Hassa.

Ten days ago, I left Koweit in the boom named "Musallini," property of Mubarek-us-Sabah. We left at night and reached the Shatt about morning. We saw the Belgians near the buoy (central), about a mile or less from the entrance to the

Fao creek. I don't know how many Belgians there were. They were in a jolly-boat belonging to the "Muzafferi." There were perhaps eight men, and among them was one Belgian, at least he appeared to be a Christian. The others were Persians and Mahomedans. They fired at us four times from about 200 yards away. No damage was done. They did not hit the boat. We knew it was ball cartridge from the noise of the bullets. We went straight off and returned to Koweit.

N.B.—This man was extraordinarily frightened, and I am afraid that the fear of being led off to instant execution afterwards made him conceal a good deal of what he knew.—S. G. K.

Dated Koweit, the 25th September, 1904.

STATEMENT No. 3.

Name	Salim.
Father's name	Yakoob.
Age	50 years.
Occupation	Sailor.
Residence	Bussorah.

About ten or twelve days ago, I left Koweit in the boom "Musallini," property of Sheikh Mubarek. We left at night for Fao. We saw the Belgians at Gusbah. There were six men in the jolly-boat. The jolly-boat was coming off from Gusbah in the direction of Fao. The jolly-boat was from the man-of-war at Gusbah. They shot at us four times. They were about 100 yards away or more. They shot ball, but did us no harm. They hit nothing at all in the boat. The boom stopped, and we all said, "This is the boom of Sheikh Mubarek. It takes the post to Fao." They said, "We must search it." They searched the boom and found nothing. When they found nothing they went off to Gusbah, and we went to Fao and anchored by the Sheikh's house. This all happened in the afternoon, and we were kept waiting from the afternoon until the evening over this business. Of the six men in the boat, one was a Belgian and the rest were Persians.

Dated Koweit, the 25th September, 1904.

STATEMENT No. 4.

Name	Feroz.
Father's name	Salim.
Age	25 years.
Occupation	Sailor.
Residence	Zayria, near Fao.

Ten days ago, I left Koweit in the boom named "Musallini," property of Sheikh Mubarek. We left Koweit at night for Fao. We reached Fao about mid-day. On the way we met the jolly-boat of the Belgians in front of Fao at the head of the creek. They fired at us four times. We were none of us killed or wounded. They fired at about 25 paces distance. They did not hit the boat, but they hit the sail. There were six men in the jolly-boat. They were all of the same colour. They were none of them Persians, but all Belgians. I did not say anything, but the other men in the boom said, "This is the boom of Sheikh Mubarek. There are no arms in it." The Belgians said, "We do not know Sheikh Mubarek. We have to search for arms." They spoke to us in Arabic. Our boom stopped, and the Belgians got in and lighted a candle and went through the cabin and hunted all over; they found nothing. They went off, and another jolly-boat came and opened the Nakhoda's box and found nothing in it. There were seven men in the second jolly-boat. They searched among the sail and among the bundles of date wood and found nothing. Then that lot also went off to the man-of-war, the small one, belonging to the Persians. We went off and anchored in the head of the creek. We were delayed about an hour.

Dated Koweit, the 25th September, 1904.

(Signed) S. G. KNOX, Captain,
Political Agent, Koweit.

Inclosure 31 in No. 26.

Captain Knox to Major Cox.

Koweit, September 27, 1904.

IN continuation of previous correspondence, and especially with reference to my confidential letter, dated the 18th September,* to your address, I have the honour to forward a translation of a letter received from Sheikh Mubarek in which he complains that two vessels belonging to Koweit subjects have been seized by the servants of the Imperial Customs of Persia in the Shat-el-Arab.

2. I have since heard that one of the vessels has been released after the payment of a fine of 100*l*. and the confiscation of the arms found therein, and that the other boat has been taken to Bushire.

Inclosure 32 in No. 26.

Sheikh Mubarak-us-Subah to Captain Knox.

5th Rajab, 1322 (September 16, 1904).

THE ships of our subjects of Koweit which travel to Bussorah, great and small, carry arms according to the number in the boat, Nakhoda, steersman, and crew; and that has been done for the past three years for self-protection from pirates, who are notorious in Bussorah; and the officials of the Turkish Government and of the Ruler of Mohammerah, Sheikh Khazel Khan, who protects the Shatt, see that and have not prevented them because of the necessity, for the object of the people of the ships is the protection of themselves and their property.

And now the Persian ship, in which are the Belgians, has occupied the Shatt between the buoy and Fao and has seized two vessels belonging to our subjects of Koweit and with them their arms, which were only in case of need; they have annoyed them to the utmost, and have seized the weapons and taken the boats to Mohammerah; and now news has reached us that they will also take the aforesaid boats to Bushire. And these matters are contrary to the rules of the Government of the present day, and we hope from your fair justice and your protection that you will not acquiesce in the vexation of our subjects, the people of Koweit, who have sought shelter with your precious Imperial Government. Therefore we have petitioned to you in full. We hope you will take notice of this affair, and may you remain guarded, &c.

Inclosure 33 in No. 26.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

MY letter regarding Koweit dhow.

Bushire, October 25, 1904.

Nakhoda still in confinement with local authorities. Director-General, Customs, has referred matter to Tehran, but has received no reply.

Inclosure 34 in No. 26.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

KOWEIT dhows.

Bushire, November 11, 1904.

Please refer to my telegram dated the 25th October, 1904. The Customs Department are endeavouring to induce Nakhoda to execute deeds of gifts of dhows in favour of the Persian Government by holding out promises of pardon. Soonnee Imam here reports that he has been approached on behalf of the Customs and Nakhoda

* Not forwarded, being unimportant.—S. G. K. October 15, 1904.

to draw up the documents, but has postponed action pending the receipt of our advice. Believe Nakhoda is a part owner of the dhows. It is probable that pressure will be put on to force Imam's hands. The matter may be temple [sic] if a transfer is effected. Early orders in this case are solicited.

Inclosure 35 in No. 26.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, November 14, 1904.

(Telegraphic.)

REFERRING to previous correspondence ending with my telegram dated 11th November regarding Koweit dhow, local Customs state that orders received from Tehran, Saturday, confirming their *procès-verbal*, and ordering Article 32 of "Règlement" to be enforced, viz., confiscation of dhow and everything on board, and imprisonment of Nakhoda until fine equal to twice the value of contraband articles is paid.

(Addressed Foreign, with Viceroy, repeated Simla.)

Inclosure 36 in No. 26.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

Bushire, November 13, 1904.

WITH reference to correspondence ending with my telegram of yesterday, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of translation of a letter from Sheikh Mubarek which I have received from the Political Agent, Koweit, regarding the ill-treatment which certain Koweit Nakhodas have received at the hands of Belgian officials of the Persian Customs Administration.

2. The Nakhoda of the dhow to which the Sheikh refers is still in custody, together with a companion, and the dhow is still detained.

In answer to all queries the Director-General of Customs replies that the entire case was referred to his Central Administration at Tehran, and that he can take no action without orders from the Ministry, which have not yet been received.

Inclosure 37 in No. 26.

Mubarak-us-Subah to Captain Knox.

(Translation.)

(Extract.)

October 19, 1904.

AND as for the Belgians who seized the boats of our subjects, in one of which was ten rifles, and in the other twenty-four rifles.

2. As for the ten rifles, they belonged to one of the people of Bussorah, and the Nakhoda was not aware of what had been added and wrapped up by the owner.

3. And the twenty-four rifles were in two boxes belonging to one of the people of Zubair; the barrels were in one box and the butts in another, and equally the Nakhoda of the boom knew nothing about it, except that there were two boxes containing goods.

4. And the boat of the Belgians seized them and fined the boom in which there were ten rifles, 6,000 krans, and released it. And the Belgians took the other boom to Bushire and imprisoned the Nakhoda, and demanded from him 12,000 krans.

5. Now the crew of the boom are my subjects, and are under the protection of the Government. It is therefore necessary that the Belgians should hand over the boats either to the Consul of the British Government at Mohammerah or to the Resident in Bushire, and the punishment they deserve should be at your hands, for we also are prohibiting all our ships from the carrying of arms and restraining them;

* Complicated (?).

but, in a case like this, it will be hard on them, for they do not know what the consignor loads, and we remain watching events as they pass over us unjustly, and have explained the state of affairs to you. Then let not what we have mentioned to you pass into (neglect—forgetfulness). These are matters injurious, and may you remain safe.

Inclosure 38 in No. 26.

Government of India to Major Cox.

(Telegraphic.)

Viceroy's Camp, November 28, 1904.

YOUR telegram 14th November.

From McDouall's letter, 23rd September, we understand dhow in question admittedly had concealed on board twenty-eight rifles which may reasonably be presumed contraband. We are unable, therefore, to assist. In case of dhow having only twelve rifles required for defence of vessel, we have suggested representation to Persian Government.

Copy of despatch follows.

Inclosure 39 in No. 26.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, November 20, 1904.

IN continuation of my letter dated the 14th October, 1904, I have the honour to submit, for the information of the Government of India, the following Report on the subject of the search of a boom belonging to Sheikh Mubarek by the Persian Customs ship "Muzafferi."

On the 27th October I addressed M. Waffelaert, giving him a précis of the statements of the crew of the Sheikh's boom, and pointing out that the boom was apparently examined close to Fao, and asking him to inquire into the matter.

On the 3rd November (on the return of the "Muzafferi" to Bushire) M. Waffelaert replied, and I have the honour to inclose a copy of his communication for the information of the Government of India.

M. Waffelaert appears to be under the impression that any native craft can be searched in any place on suspicion of having "contraband" on board.

The Sheikh's "boom" plies between Koweit and Fao taking mails, bringing firewood, &c., and even if it had firearms on board, it seems to me that the matter would lie between Sheikh Mubarek and the Turkish authorities.

The action of the "Muzafferi" undoubtedly caused a great deal of irritation throughout the Arab coast, and if such high-handed actions on the part of the Customs continue, I think the Arabs may possibly attempt some kind of reprisals.

If, therefore, the Government of India agree that indiscriminate searching of native craft in the Shat-el-Arab is contrary to international law and custom, I trust that they will be pleased to take steps to prevent the Persian Customs Department from abusing the rights of search in this way.

Inclosure 40 in No. 26.

M. Waffelaert to Captain Trevor.

Bushire, November 3, 1904.

IN continuation of my letter of the 27th ultimo, I beg to state that, from the inquiry instituted from the Commander of the steam-ship "Muzafferi," it follows that the boat has detained many "booms" and "bellums," but has never kept them longer than it was necessary for searching the inside of the craft.

The Commander of our boat does not recollect anything particular about the boom "Mosolim," but the mere fact of the crew's shouting out that the vessel belonged to Sheikh Mubarek was not sufficient to prove that the boat did not carry contraband goods.

Besides, beyond searching in the boat, no harm whatever has been done, neither to the craft or to the crew.

Inclosure 41 in No. 26.

*Major Cox to Government of India.**Bushire, November 20, 1904.*

IN confirmation of my telegram of the 14th November, 1904, I have the honour to state, for the information of the Government of India, that the Director-General of Customs has informed me that the Koweit dhow belonging to Abdul Aziz-bin-Farah of Koweit, which has been detained here, will now be confiscated. Instructions have been issued by the Central Customs Administration that the Nakhoda of the dhow will be imprisoned until the fine of 18,000 krans is paid, or until further orders.

2. I submit that this is an exceedingly high-handed proceeding, as there was absolutely no evidence brought forward at the investigation at Mohammerah (*vide* Mr. Consul McDouall's Report sent with my letter, dated the 1st October, 1904) to show that the rifles were intended for Persia.

3. M. Waffelaert also declares that "all articles on board" will also be confiscated under Article 5 of the Act of the 5th Ramzan, 1317. I have pointed out that only articles used to conceal the contraband goods should be confiscated, but M. Waffelaert does not agree, and the question has been referred to Tehran. There were on board the dhow four bales of canvas belonging to one Haji Mukhbil, of Bahrein, consigned by him to Suleiman-bin-Mahmud-el-Thakeir, of Bussorah, and it was in connection with a request made by me that Haji Mukhbil's canvas should be returned, that the question of Article 5 of the Act of the 5th Ramzan came up.

No. 27.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 14.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 13th January, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, January 14, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 27.

*Government of India to Mr. Brodrick**January 13, 1905.*

(Telegraphic.) P.

ADEN delimitation: Your telegrams of the 3rd and 7th instant.

Position is obscure, and we await details which may throw light upon it. Meantime, in the absence of information as to the manner in which the Turks propose to draw the line from Mudariba to Kuddam, we are not in a position to express an opinion. With regard, however, to the Porte's proposal whereby British troops are to be debarred from entering the Nine Cantons, this could not be made admissible by any offer on their part to give us more than we claimed in respect of the Subaihi border. As now demarcated, the Nine Cantons become virtually British territory.

(Repeated to Mr. Fitzmaurice.)

No. 28.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 15.)

(No. 14.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, January 15, 1905.

MESSRS. Lorimer and Gabriel's journey.

With reference to my despatch No. 22 of the 10th instant, His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad informs me by telegraph that Turkish authorities, having allowed these gentlemen to start for Nedjef, have now issued orders to stop them.

I have been informed by the Sublime Porte, in answer to representations which I made on the subject, that they can go to Kerbela (which they might possibly do via

Hillah and Nedjef). Porte have heard from Vali of Bussorah that they insisted on going to Nedjef and Nejd, at the former of which places the expedition against Ibn Saud is collecting.

Shall I press for them to be allowed to go to Nedjef? I think it would be unreasonable and impolitic to insist on their being given permission to go to Nejd under existing circumstances.

I have telegraphed to Major Newmarch to inquire what is the real destination of these officers.

No. 29.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 16.)

(No. 16.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 10, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Damascus, reporting that 7,000 Turkish troops from different parts of the Ottoman Empire will shortly be passing through Damascus on their way to Ma'an by the Hejaz Railway with, it is reported, the Yemen for their ultimate destination.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 29.

Consul Richards to Mr. Townley.

(No. 59.)

Sir,

Damascus, December 24, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to report that, according to information received from a reliable quarter, 7,000 Turkish troops coming from different parts of the Empire (Smyrna and Salonica are both mentioned), inclusive of other districts in this "Ordou" (army district), will very shortly be passing through Damascus on their way to Ma'an by the Hejaz Railway and so to Akaba. From there they will proceed by sea to some port in the Yemen, which is said to be their ultimate destination. I understand that a Committee consisting of three officers on the staff here will shortly leave for Akaba with a view to superintending the embarkation of the troops there.

I cannot at present guarantee the truth of the above, but I believe it to be based on fact. Any further development I shall not fail to report, if necessary, by telegraph.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. S. RICHARDS.

No. 30.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 16.)

(No. 22.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 10, 1905.

ABOUT a month ago I received a request from the Government of India to procure the necessary permission for two officials of the Government, Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel, to travel in the vilayets of Bussorah and Bagdad for the purpose of collecting statistics and acquiring general information for the Gazetteer of India. I accordingly addressed a request to the Porte, and after I had ascertained that it had been passed on by the Grand Vizier to the Palace, I caused the usual steps to be taken there to expedite the issue of the permission.

I was doubtful from the first as to whether the Sultan would grant the request I had preferred in the name of the Indian Government, because I know how jealous His Majesty is of British visitors to the regions mentioned, but I was not prepared for the accusation made to Mr. Lamb, as set forth in the accompanying copy of his Memorandum, that the Vali of Bussorah had ascertained that the real object of the two

[1516]

P

officers, who had already been carrying on suspicious operations in the neighbourhood of Koweit, was to visit Ibn Saoud and encourage him in his resistance to the Turkish troops.

Mr. Lamb very properly at once categorically denied that Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel's journey had any such object, and pointed out that His Majesty's Embassy had not failed to inform the Sublime Porte of their approaching visit, and had requested the necessary permits to enable them to carry out their mission.

I yesterday spoke to the Grand Vizier with some warmth on this subject, and reminded his Highness that it was hardly a friendly act to accuse a friendly Power of sending officers to support and encourage a successful Arab chief in his resistance to the Imperial forces. I said that it was ridiculous to suppose that His Majesty's Government would employ officers for such a purpose, or that it would be worth their while to foster intrigues against the Turkish Government, but that it was little short of insulting to accuse us of such an intention with officers whose approaching visit had been politely notified to the Porte beforehand.

Ferid Pasha tried to excuse himself by saying that he did not connect Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel with the officers whose presence had been reported from Bussorah, that foreign Consuls were responsible for the suspicions which had been raised, and that now that the Embassy had explained the real object of their visit there was no more to be said, and the Sultan would be fully satisfied.

I pointed out to his Highness that the complaint made to Mr. Lamb was based upon a report made by the Vali of Bussorah on the strength of information received from his secret agents at Koweit, and that the impropriety on the part of the Sultan's Government in harbouring such suspicions of the acts of a friendly Power still remained. I added that the best way to prove that our good faith was not doubted, was to issue the permissions asked for without further delay.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 30.

Memorandum by Mr. Lamb.

THE Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to-day communicated to me a Vizierial letter, dated the 21st (3rd) instant, from Moukhliiss Pasha, the Commandant and Vali of Bussorah, in which he states that the secret agent dispatched by him to Koweit for the purpose of inquiring into the doings of the Englishmen, who had been displaying flags in and about that town, had returned to Bussorah. This agent's report fully corroborated the statements made in his previous telegrams of the 15th (28th), 17th (30th), and 19th (1st), respectively, viz., that the object of these Englishmen was principally to send emissaries to Ibn Saoud to incite him to still further develop and extend the scope of his seditious designs against the Imperial Government.

The Vizierial letter went on to say that these and other nefarious proceedings of the Englishmen demand attention, and directed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to make representations to the British Embassy with a view to causing a stop to be put to them.

I caused an answer to be returned to this communication to the effect that His Majesty's Embassy met these insinuations with a categorical denial, and that the idea of English officials inciting Ibn Saoud against the Imperial Government was too absurd for discussion, and that the officials who had recently visited Koweit were no doubt Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel, who had no political mission whatever, but were simply charged with the collection of topographical information for a new edition of the Gazetteer, as His Majesty's Embassy had not failed to inform the Porte in due season, when it gave notice of their intended voyage, and solicited facilities for their visit to the vilayets of Bussorah and Bagdad.

(Signed) HARRY H. LAMB.

January 5, 1905.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 16.)

(No. 27.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 10, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 7 of the 3rd instant respecting the troubles in the Yemen Vilayet, I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Hodeidah, giving some account of the serious nature which the Arab risings in that province have assumed.

A report has been current here during the last few days that Sana'a, the capital of the Yemen, has fallen into the hands of the rebels. This has not been confirmed, and the Porte are much irritated at the publicity given to the story. They express themselves as confident that the reinforcements which have already reached Hodeidah will prove sufficient to stem the tide of rebellion and relieve the military posts at present invested, and that, upon the arrival of the additional troops, whose departure for the Yemen has been reported to your Lordship from time to time, order will be speedily restored.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 31.

Vice-Consul Richardson to Consul Devey.

(No. 105.)

Sir,

Camaran, December 20, 1904.

HIS Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires telegraphed to me inquiring about the state of affairs in this vilayet, and I replied by wire in the sense of my despatch No. 102 of the 8th instant, which was all the information at my disposal at the time.

I have since learnt that the Arab risings throughout the Yemen are of a more serious nature than was at first supposed, and tend to become general.

During my residence at Sana'a, I found that it was an open secret that the new Imam would give the Turks considerable trouble after the departure of Abdulla Pasha, the late Vali and Commander-in-chief, and that preparations were being made to organize a general revolt throughout the mountainous districts of the Yemen, where the natives are adherents of the Imam.

A few of the principal Arab traders and a certain Italian merchant, all of whom I used to meet at the capital, appeared to be laying in a stock of provisions then, as it was anticipated that the town would be threatened, if not actually invested.

It is now nearly six weeks that postal communication between Hodeidah and Sana'a has been entirely cut off, and telegrams can but with great difficulty be got through by other circuitous routes.

The caravan tract between Menakha, the first garrisoned town in the mountains, situated about 55 miles directly north-east of Hodeidah and 75 miles by the usual road, and Suk-el-Khamis, a village built on a range of mountains directly opposite in an easterly direction and about 25 miles distant, has been rendered unsafe by the rebels who command the heights running in parallel lines between the two above-mentioned places, as also others in the neighbourhood.

It was rumoured here that the insurgents had invested Menakha from the east, which its geographical position would easily permit.

The road further north-east of Suk-el-Khamis is disturbed near a place called Buan, where the Turks have two block-houses and maintain a small garrison.

It is not definitely known whether Sana'a has been besieged or not, but the interruption of the road between Menakha and Khamis has rendered it impossible for supplies to reach the large body of troops stationed there from the Hodeidah side.

The mortality from starvation among the troops is supposed to be considerable. It is known to me that the Turkish commissariat keeps no reserve of provisions whatever.

News that has filtered through to Hodeidah describes the plight of the inhabitants and soldiers as most wretched. The price of food has risen to siege rates: 30 dollars are asked for a sack of grain, whereas the value under ordinary conditions would be from 10 to 15 dollars (one Maria Theresa dollar is equivalent to 1s. 10d.). The charge for a

bag of flour, weighing $1\frac{1}{2}$ cwt., has risen to 50 dollars against the usual rate of 20 dollars.

I am also informed that the Hashid and Bekil tribes inhabiting the country north of Sana'a have risen, and are giving trouble at Hajje and Hujjur.

There is no doubt that the Arabs in the vicinity of Sana'a have seized their long watched-for opportunity of participating in a revolt against the Turks.

The Mutessarif of Hodeidah has left for Bajl accompanied by a few Sheikhs from the Tehama to await the arrival there of 2,000 armed Arabs from the plains, whom the above Sheikhs have pledged themselves to raise to assist the authorities to force a passage through to Sana'a with provisions for the starving garrison.

Reinforcements are being sent from Assyr; two battalions of Redifs stationed there are being transported to Loheia, whence they will march in the direction of Menakha.

Fresh drafts from Constantinople are daily expected to arrive at Cumfuda and Hodeidah.

Syyed Ahmed-es-Sherai Pasha, the President of the local municipality, and the most influential resident of Hodeidah, is raising a native force of 600 men, whom the military authorities are arming and forming into a "Hameedia" corps, which, on completion, will be utilized against the insurgents in the mountains.

I have, &c.

(Signed) G. A. RICHARDSON.

No. 32.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 16.)

(No. 28.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 10, 1905.

WITH reference to previous correspondence respecting preparations for the Nejd expedition, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copies of despatches from His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad respecting mobilization of troops and collection of camels at Mosul.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure 1 in No. 32.

Consul-General Newmarsh to Mr. Townley.

(No. 988/76.)

Sir,

Bagdad, December 2, 1904.

THE Consular Agent at Mosul reports as follows in one of his letters dated the 22nd November, 1904:—

"An order has lately been issued, calling out the reserves of this vilayet. The 3rd Battalion has already been assembled from the 24th Firka of the 47th Lowa of the 93rd Alai.

"This mobilization is due to the alleged fights going on between Ibn Rashid and Ibn Sabah, because the Turkish Government intends to assist Ibn Rashid by sending him soldiers."

I have, &c.

(Signed) L. S. NEWMARCH, Major.

Inclosure 2 in No. 32.

Consul-General Newmarch to Mr. Townley.

(No. 1010/78.)

Sir,

Bagdad, December 12, 1904.

IN continuation of my despatch No. 988/76 dated the 2nd instant, I have the honour to submit the following further report from the British Consular Agent at Mosul regarding the projected expedition against Ibn Saoud:—

"I have the honour to inform you that some days ago an order was issued from the Grand Vizier at Constantinople to the Vali of Mosul to the effect that about 1,000

camels should be collected from the Vilayet of Mosul for the transport of military stores and ammunition. Sheikh Assi, son of Ferhan Pasha, who is now in prison with his followers, has promised to give 100 camels, and the local Government have distributed part of the demand among the various quarters of Mosul, including Mahomedans, Christians, and Jews. The rest will be collected from the vilayet and from the immediate neighbourhood."

2. I hear that the Turks contemplate permanently garrisoning El Kasim, and that the alleged assistance to Ibn Rashid is merely a pretext to cover their ulterior design.

I have, &c.

(Signed) L. S. NEWMARCH, Major.

No. 33.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 16.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice, dated the 15th January, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, January 16, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 33.

Mr. Fitzmaurice to Mr. Townley.

(Telegraphic.) P.

January 15, 1905.

ADEN delimitation. I believe that instructions quoted by Turkish Ambassador have reached the Turkish Commissioner, and that he is in communication with the Porte with a view to slight rectification about "line from Kudam." Commissioner, however, still denies having received the instructions.

(Repeated to Secretary of State and Foreign Secretary, Government of India.)

No. 34.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 16.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 13th January, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, January 16, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 34.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, January 13, 1905.

ADEN delimitation. Please see the telegram of the 9th instant from the Resident at Aden. Instructions have been sent to His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Constantinople that compliance with the original demand of His Majesty's Government, including recognition of frontier north-east, is to be pressed for. He is to state that the proposed stipulation precluding the entry of troops into the Nine Cantons is wholly inadmissible, and he is to explain to the Turkish Government the misconceptions in their Memorandum, by which territory is given us to which His Majesty's Government waive their claim, provided that the territory in question is not ceded to any other Power.

(Repeated to Resident, Aden.)

No. 35.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 24.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 17, 1905.

WITH reference to your despatch No. 870 of the 14th November, 1904, I transmit herewith copy of a letter from the India Office on the subject of the pirate, Ahmad-bin-Selman.*

The Government of India in their despatch inclosed in this letter express the belief that the pirate has been shielded by the Turkish local authorities, and refer to other incidents which show the need for effective action for the suppression of piracy in the Persian Gulf.

Should the Turkish Government have returned no answer to your recent representation, it would seem advisable to recur to the matter at an early date, and to ask for the assurance suggested by the Secretary of State for India.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 36.

Musurus Pasha to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 18.)

MUSURUS PACHA présente ses compliments au Marquis de Lansdowne, et a l'honneur de porter à la connaissance de sa Seigneurie que, d'après les informations fournies à la Sublime Porte par l'Ambassade Impériale à Téhéran, le Consul Britannique à Bouchir a fait des démarches auprès des autorités de cette dernière ville au sujet de la saisie, par les dites autorités, d'un navire chargé d'articles de contrebande destinés aux habitants de Koueit.

Comme les Agents du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique n'ont point le droit de couvrir de leur protection les habitants de Koueit, où le *statu quo* doit être observé, conformément à l'entente intervenue, l'Ambassadeur de Turquie vient, sur l'invitation de son Gouvernement, prier le Marquis de Lansdowne de vouloir bien munir le Consul Britannique à Bouchir d'instructions en conséquence.

*Ambassade Impériale de Turquie, Londres,
le 18 Janvier, 1905.*

No. 37.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 27.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 18, 1905.

THE Turkish Ambassador told me to-day that he had informed the Turkish Government of the statement which I had made to him on the 9th instant (Foreign Office telegram No. 3) to the effect that it was impossible for His Majesty's Government to accept the Turkish stipulation that we should be precluded from sending troops into the Aden cantons. Musurus Pasha said that the Turkish Government regarded this declaration on my part as one of serious importance, involving a disturbance of the *status quo*, and likely to retard the execution of the decision lately adopted by the Turkish Government in reference to the Aden cantons. His Excellency referred me to a despatch said to have been written on the 8th February, 1873, by Lord Granville, and to contain a declaration in support of the Turkish claim.

I repeated that the demand made by the Turkish Government was, in our opinion, wholly unreasonable. It was admitted by the Turkish Government that the tribes of which the frontier had lately been demarcated were under our protection, and it appeared to me absurd to suggest that we should be denied the power of sending a single soldier to maintain order in the country, or even to prevent the tribes from interfering with our possessions. What, I asked, was to happen supposing them to be guilty of serious misconduct in the immediate neighbourhood of Aden? Was it seriously claimed that in such a case we should have no right to punish them? I

* No. 17.

59

deeply regretted that throughout these negotiations the Turkish Government had behaved in what seemed to me to be a most unreasonable manner, and I begged his Excellency to understand that it was impossible for us to tolerate the manner in which they had treated our just demands.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 38.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 18, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit to you, to be laid before the Secretary of State for India, copy of a despatch to His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Constantinople,* recording a conversation with the Turkish Ambassador on the subject of alleged proceedings of British officers in Arabia.

I am also to inclose copies of a despatch and a telegram since received from Mr. Townley† regarding the visit of Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel to the Vilayets of Bussorah and Bagdad.

Mr. Brodrick will observe that the officers are stated by the Vali of Bussorah to have insisted on going not merely to Nedjef, but to Nejd also.

No information besides that contained in these papers has reached this Department, and as it is evidently the journey of Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel which has given rise to the complaint made by Musurus Pasha, Lord Lansdowne would be obliged if Mr. Brodrick would take steps to ascertain what were the precise instructions given to these officers by the Government of India, and what are their intended movements.

Lord Lansdowne thinks that in present circumstances it would not be advisable that they should travel in Arabia, and they should at all events avoid visiting the disturbed districts.

I am, &c.

(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 39.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 19.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 15th December, relative to the status of Zanzibar subjects in Muscat.

India Office, January 18, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 39.

*Major Cox to Government of India.**Bushire, July 30, 1904.*

I HAVE the honour to forward, for the consideration of the Government of India, copies of certain correspondence connected with the question of the status of Zanzibar subjects in Oman.

2. The only reference to the subject which I can trace will be found in the correspondence connected with the unauthorized return to Oman of Sheikh Hilal-bin-Amr-el-Harthi, vide Foreign Department letter dated the 13th November, 1900, and connected papers.

At that time no necessity arose for raising the general issue with the Sultan.

3. Referring now to the Muscat Agency letter of the 5th instant, I am doubtful whether it would be good policy on our part to follow the course suggested by the

* No. 6.

† Nos. 28 and 30.

Political Agent. The Government of India is aware that from time immemorial, and as the natural consequence of the fact that Zanzibar was formerly an appanage and offshoot of the Sultanate of Oman, there has been and is a constant stream of intercourse between the two Principalities.

It would be extremely difficult in many cases to ascertain whether an individual with a domicile fluctuating between the two territories, and having relations in both, were a Zanzibari or a Muscati.

4. Hitherto, as observed in my letter to the Political Agent, persons coming from Zanzibar have been tacitly left to the jurisdiction of the Sultan, and during my time at Muscat I cannot recall ever having been asked by a Zanzibari to give protection adversely to the jurisdiction of the Sultan of Muscat.

It can hardly be considered, I think, that any special circumstances have lately arisen, calling for a special pronouncement on the subject to the Sultan, and I am inclined to the opinion that such a course would probably wound his sensibilities, and that, in the implied effacement of Zanzibar as a State involving a nationality, Seyyid Feisal and his subjects would be inclined to point a moral for themselves which would not be helpful to our future policy in regard to Oman.

5. At the same time it might be as well, if Government of India see no objection, if the Political Agent, without making a special occasion for it, were to use a convenient opportunity to explain to the Sultan that our protectorate over Zanzibar gives us such a right, but that we have no desire to press the use of it, so long as there is no special occasion to do so.

6. In remarking, in paragraph 2 of his letter, that we can scarcely be said to be very strongly supported by the Sultan in regard to the suppression of the Slave Trade, I think Captain Grey perhaps underrated the Sultan's difficulties and does not quite give him credit for what he does in this connection.

Without having the material at hand to enable me to quote figures, I think I am right in saying that during the past five years not less than 90 per cent. of slaves claiming freedom at Muscat have been released with His Highness's concurrence, and that in cases where manumission has been refused, there have been reasonable grounds for that course. The Ruler of Muscat is placed in a very difficult position in regard to the slave question generally, and I think Government is aware, that as far as the Suri slave-traders are concerned, he has for several years past been practically impotent to handle them owing to the certainty of falling foul of the French flag in the attempt.

The information afforded in Inclosure No. 5, recently received from the Political Agent, shows, I think, that Seyyid Feisal is ready to do his best in the matter.

At the same time I quite agree that his best falls short of the ideal, and that if a lever for pressure is required, the question of the Slave Trade in Oman will generally be found to furnish material for it.

7. Requesting that the views of the Government on the Zanzibar nationality question may be communicated to me in due course.

Inclosure 2 in No. 39.

Consul-General Sinclair to Major Cox.

Zanzibar, April 20, 1904.

WITH reference to the correspondence ending with your despatch of the 10th October last year, I have the honour to inform you that the Zanzibar Government have since ascertained that the dhow which left Pemba and was suspected of carrying slaves to Muscat was wrecked on the Italian coast between Ras Kher and Ras Hafun, and that six of the slaves were sold to a Somali Chief named Sumuntar Abdi of Ras-el-Mabad. It is stated by a member of the crew named Hamis-bin-Sudim, who returned to Mombasa and was there arrested, that the owner of the dhow, a Pemba Arab named Saleh-bin-Ali Besal, accompanied by three other Arabs, Salim-bin-Abdi Bweli, Henwedum-bin-Shaib Hawajir and Ameer-bin-Said-bin-Hassan proceeded to Muscat, taking with them one slave girl, whom they refused to sell, in another dhow, and that they are still there. If this is the case, I would request you to be good enough to take any steps that may be in your power to effect their arrest and return to Zanzibar. I presume that subjects of the Sultan of Zanzibar when in the Oman dominions are under the jurisdiction of the Sultan of Muscat in the same way that Oman subjects are, when

here, amenable to the Sultan of Zanzibar's jurisdiction, but it has occurred to me as possible that you may claim Zanzibaris as being natives of a British Protectorate, and I should be glad if you will favour me with your views on this point.

Inclosure 3 in No. 39.

Major Cox to Captain Grey.

June 24, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to advert to letter dated the 20th April, 1904, from the Acting Consul-General, Zanzibar, re-addressed to you from here last mail.

2. Referring to the concluding sentence of Consul-General Sinclair's communication, I do not think that the question of our claiming, adversely to the Sultan, jurisdiction over Zanzibar subjects in Oman has hitherto ever been in issue, and so far as my knowledge goes, such persons, in the absence of any reasons to the contrary, have been tacitly left to the jurisdiction of His Highness.

3. The general question is one which might at any time become important, and a reference to Government may be advisable. Before this course is taken, however, and before any reply is sent to this part of Mr. Sinclair's letter, I shall be glad if you will let me have your views on the subject, after reference to your records.

4. It will be advisable not to discuss this point with the Sultan, and action had better be taken in the present case through His Highness.

Inclosure 4 in No. 39.

Captain Grey to Major Cox.

Muscat, July 5, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to comply with the instructions contained in your letter dated the 24th June.

2. The question involved in this correspondence appears to have now come up for the first time, and there is little or nothing in my records which would assist me in forming an opinion upon it. I cannot help thinking, however, that it would be better, all things considered, for us to claim jurisdiction over Zanzibaris in Oman. Hitherto, as you observe, they have been tacitly left to the jurisdiction of the local Government, but as we can scarcely be said to be very strongly supported by the Sultan in regard to the suppression of the Slave Trade, and since, as far as I can see, it would be chiefly in that connection—as in the present instance—that jurisdiction over Zanzibaris would have to be exercised, I am of opinion that we should take the present opportunity of settling the matter as I suggest.

3. It is unlikely, I submit, that His Highness would raise any objection, and he would probably be glad to be saved some extra trouble. Moreover, perhaps if the Zanzibaris knew that they were under our jurisdiction in Oman, and therefore more likely to be caught and severely dealt with, it might help to keep them from having slave dealings with the people of His Highness's dominions.

4. There would be some difficulty in deciding the status of such people in the event of their claiming the Sultan's protection as Arabs and not Zanzibaris (i.e., born in Zanzibar), but arrangements for obviating this might be made in communication with Mr. Sinclair.

5. Paragraph 4 of your letter under reply is noted.

Inclosure 5 in No. 39.

Consular Memorandum.

Name of Applicant.—Shamloo-bin-Ibrahim, Baluch, aged about 11 years.

States: Was born at Konkruan in Mekran. Some seven months ago was kidnapped along with his brother while driving sheep to the grazing ground, and taken to Jask, where Ibrahim-bin-Mahomed Gummoo purchased him. Ibrahim brought

him to Sohar and sold him there to an Arab, by name Hamed, through Belal-bin-Hasan of Jask, who happened to be at Sohar at the time. Does not know the fate of his brother, who was kidnapped at the same time.

Order: Give Paper.

The Sultan has rescued this boy from slavery through his Wali of Sohar, and has sent him here.

(Signed) W. G. GREY.

Muscat, July 11, 1904.

Inclosure 6 in No. 39.

Government of India to Major Cox.

Fort William, December 1, 1904.

Sir,

IN reply to your letter dated the 30th July, 1904, I am directed to say that it is understood that the immediate point referred to for the orders of the Government of India is as to the powers of the Consul at Muscat to arrest and deliver to the Consul-General at Zanzibar a native of that Protectorate who, after committing the offence of slave-trading, has taken refuge in Oman territory.

2. With regard to this point, I am to say that subjects of the Sultan of Zanzibar are under the protection of His Majesty's Government, and that the provisions of "The Muscat Order in Council (1867)," relating to British subjects, apply to such persons by virtue of section 37 of the Order. The provisions of the Order as to the deportation of British subjects, however, authorize deportation to Bombay only, and that only under specified conditions; and in view of the fact that the Fugitive Offenders Act has not been declared to be in force in Oman, proceedings cannot be taken under that Act. The surrender and delivery of the persons in question to the authorities at Zanzibar can therefore only be effected by arrangement with the Sultan of Muscat.

3. With reference to the general question of the status of Zanzibar subjects in Oman, I am to say that it is advisable, if possible, to avoid raising the matter, so long as there is no special occasion to do so.

I have, &c.
(Signed) L. RUSSELL.

No. 40.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 19.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 22nd December, relative to recent disorders at Bahrein.

India Office, January 18, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 40.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, December 12, 1904.

(Telegraphic.)

BAHREIN affairs.

In case of assault on German merchant, following settlement arrived at after much pressure. Fuller details by post:—

1. Four identified ringleaders publicly flogged in presence of complainant, and afterwards expelled.

2. 1,000 rupees deposited at Bahrein Agency as compensation to German; amount not yet disbursed, pending the approval of the Government of India.

3. Written undertaking from Sheikh of Bahrein to effect that Sheikh Ali and followers shall leave Bahrein within a week after my departure, and remain absent for three weeks in order to allow Government time to decide as to Sheikh Ali's future.

Inclosure 2 in No. 40.

Major Cox to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

BAHREIN affairs.

Have just returned from Bahrein.

In regard to second case, namely, injury to Shia subjects of the Shah of Persia by Sunni Arabs of Bahrein, Sheikh has been most obstinate, and has refused to meet in the slightest degree my views with regard to the punishment of offenders. The case hardly admits of satisfactory report by telegram, and I therefore request Government will await full report by post, giving conclusions arrived at. Persian Government has left it to us to see justice done. Please ask Navy to keep "Redbreast" there in the meanwhile.

Bushire, December 12, 1904.

Inclosure 3 in No. 40.

Government of India to Rear-Admiral Atkinson-Willes.

(Confidential.)

Sir,

Fort William, December 16, 1904.

WITH reference to the correspondence ending with your telegram dated the 28th ultimo, I am directed to forward, for your Excellency's information, a copy of telegrams relative to the recent cases of assault by subjects of the Sheikh of Bahrein on German and Persian subjects.

It is suggested that orders might be issued, directing His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" to remain at Bahrein for the present.

I have, &c.
(Signed) S. M. FRASER, *Officiating Secretary.*

No. 41.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 19.)

(No. 16.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, January 19, 1905.

MESSRS. LORIMER and Gabriel's journey.

My telegram No. 14 of the 15th instant.

Journey to Nedjef has been abandoned.

No. 42.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 6.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, January 20, 1905.

WE presume from your telegram No. 16 of yesterday that Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel have abandoned their visit to Nejd, as well as the one to Nedjef.

64

No. 43.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 21.)

(No. 20.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, January 21, 1905.

MESSRS. LORIMER and Gabriel's journey.

With reference to your Lordship's telegram No. 6 of yesterday, according to information from His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad, officers had no intention of going to Nejd.

I am informing Turkish Government in this sense.

No. 44.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir H. Howard.

(No. 6.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 21, 1905.

AN Agreement was signed on the 13th October, 1904, by myself and the French Ambassador at this Court, by which it was determined to submit to the arbitration of the Permanent Court of The Hague certain differences which had arisen between His Majesty's Government and that of the French Republic in regard to Muscat.

I transmit to you herewith a certified copy of the Agreement, and I request that you will communicate it to the International Bureau, in accordance with Article XXII, of the International Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes signed at The Hague on the 29th July, 1899.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 45.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 23.)

Sir,

India Office, January 21, 1905.

WITH reference to Mr. Villiers' letter of the 18th January on the subject of Turkish complaints regarding alleged proceedings of British officers in Arabia, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to inclose papers received from the Government of India regarding the tour of Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel in the neighbourhood of the Persian Gulf for the purpose of preparing a "Gazetteer."

It does not appear from these papers that any visit to Nejd has been contemplated; and it appears from Mr. Townley's telegram No. 16 of the 19th instant, that the proposed visit to Nedjef has been abandoned. Mr. Brodrick has, however, addressed a telegram to the Viceroy (copy inclosed) giving instructions that the proposed visit to El Hasa should not be carried out, and that the proceedings of the party elsewhere in Arabia should be confined to the neighbourhood of the coast. There appears to him to be no reason why further restrictions should be imposed in regard to the Peninsula of El Katr and the territory of the Trucial Chiefs, where Turkish sovereignty has never been recognized by His Majesty's Government. But he will be glad to be informed whether the instructions given appear to Lord Lansdowne to be sufficient.

With reference to your letter of the 18th January forwarding an *aide-memoire* from the Turkish Embassy, dated the 28th December, as to the action of British functionaries at Koweit, it will be observed that Mr. Brodrick has requested the Government of India to report the facts.

I am, &c.
(Signed) HORACE WALPOLE.

65

Inclosure 1 in No. 45.

*Government of India to Sir N. O'Connor.**

(Telegraphic.)

Simla, November 8, 1904.

MESSRS. LORIMER and Gabriel will visit Southern Persia and Turkish Arabia for a few weeks, next month or somewhat later, in order to collect information for the "Gazetteer of Persia." Kindly obtain for them all necessary facilities for travel, and arrange for them to be allowed to carry arms as private, not official travellers.

Repeated to Political Resident in the Persian Gulf and His Britannic Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad, for information.

Inclosure 2 in No. 45.

Government of India to Government of Bombay.

Sir,

Simla, November 8, 1904.

I AM directed to forward herewith two passports for Mr. J. G. Lorimer, C.I.E., and Lieutenant C. H. Gabriel, who are about to proceed to Persia and Turkey for the purpose of travel under the orders of the Government of India to collect information for the "Persian Gulf Gazetteer."

2. I am to request that you will be good enough to have the passports *viséd* by the Persian and Turkish Consular authorities at Bombay, and returned to this office as soon as possible.

I have, &c.
(Signed) E. H. S. CLARKE.

Inclosure 3 in No. 45.

Government of India to Major Newmarch.

(Telegraphic.)

Simla, November 9, 1904.

IN continuation of my telegram dated 8th November, Lorimer and Gabriel wish to visit Hasa as private travellers. Can you obtain special permits from the Wali of Bussorah, or do you advise the Foreign Office to apply direct to Constantinople for them?

Inclosure 4 in No. 45.

Mr. Townley to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Pera, November 9, 1904.

YOUR telegram November 8th, regarding visit of Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel to Turkish Arabia. Please give a list of the vilayets through which they propose to travel.

Inclosure 5 in No. 45.

Major Newmarch to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bagdad, November 10, 1904.

YOUR letter of 21st October and your telegram of 9th instant. No telegram dated 8th November has reached me. There is no objection to the proposed tour as far as district of Bagdad is concerned, but objections will probably be raised by Turks to the journey in Hasa. My friend Fakhr Pasha has been removed from Bussorah. I therefore suggest that you should apply direct to Constantinople, or the journey should be made without permission.

* Also to Mr. Grant Duff.

[1516]

S

Inclosure 6 in No. 45.

Government of India to Sir N. O'Connor.

(Telegraphic.)

Simla, November 11, 1904.

YOUR telegram dated 9th November. The vilayets of Bussorah and Bagdad will be visited by Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel.

Inclosure 7 in No. 45.

Government of India to Government of Bombay.

Sir,

Simla, November 15, 1904.

IN continuation of my letter dated 8th November, 1904, with which were forwarded passports for Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel to be *viséd* by the Persian and Turkish Consular authorities at Bombay, I am directed to request that the passports when completed may be forwarded to Mr. J. G. Lorimer, c/o Messrs. McIver, Mackenzie and Co., Kurrachee.

2. It is important that the passports should reach Kurrachee by the 25th November at latest.

I have, &c.
(Signed) L. RUSSELL.

Inclosure 8 in No. 45.

Government of India to Major Newmarch.

(Telegraphic.)

Simla, November 15, 1904.

MY telegram dated 8th November, to His Britannic Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, repeated to you:—

"Next month, or somewhat later, Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel will spend a few weeks visiting Turkish Arabia in order to collect information for the "Gazetteer of Persia." Kindly procure for them all necessary facilities for their journey, and arrange for them to be allowed to carry arms as private, not official travellers."

Inclosure 9 in No. 45.

Government of India to Sir N. O'Connor.

(Telegraphic.)

Simla, November 15, 1904.

IN continuation of my telegram of 11th November it is understood that Bussorah vilayet includes Hasa and Katif.

Inclosure 10 in No. 45.

Government of Bombay to Government of India.

Sir,

Bombay Castle, November 23, 1904.

WITH reference to Mr. Russell's letter dated the 15th instant, I am directed to state, for the information of the Government of India, that the passports which accompanied Mr. Clarke's letter, dated 8th instant, were forwarded to Mr. Lorimer on the 19th instant duly *viséd* by the Persian and Turkish Consular authorities at Bombay.

I have, &c.
(Signed) C. H. A. HILL

Inclosure 11 in No. 45.

Major Cox to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, December 13, 1904.

Mr. LORIMER'S tour to Koweit will not further affect the situation there, as the "Investigator" has just been surveying in and around Koweit both by sea and land. As the Sheikh himself was expected, I accordingly allowed him to proceed. When I was at Bussorah a few days ago, I was informed that the collection of camels for the Nejd transport was going on briskly.

Inclosure 12 in No. 45.

Projected Tour of Persian Gulf Gazetteer Staff, 1904-1905.

November 26.—Mr. Lorimer, Lieutenant Gabriel, and native surveyor leave Kurrachee.

November 29.—Touch at Muscat and discuss matters with Major Grey.

December 1.—Touch at Bunder Abbas, and communicate, if possible, with Assistant Political Agent.

December 4.—Touch at Bahrein and interview Captain Prideaux.

December 5-7.—Halt at Bushire, and arrange various matters with the Resident, or, in his absence, with the First Assistant.

December 8.—Arrive Koweit, where Mr. Gaskin will be in readiness to join the party. An excursion will be made, if possible, westwards. During the halt the surveyor will fix as many points as possible in different directions. Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel will then march by land to Bussorah to avoid quarantine and Custom-house delays, being joined by the British Consul from Bussorah if possible at Koweit itself, otherwise at some intermediate point. Mr. Gaskin will remain at Koweit till the return of the surveyor from the direction of Bussorah, when both of them will start for Bahrein, arriving there on the 30th December.

January 1-10.—Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel will visit Bagdad, Najaf, Kerbela, and such other important points as may be practicable, returning to Bussorah about the 20th January. Meanwhile, Mr. Gaskin will be working at Bahrein, and the surveyor will begin a map of the island, but must join Lieutenant Lorimer at Mohammerah not later than the 20th January.

January 21.—Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel will leave Bussorah by land for some point in Khuzistan, where Lieutenant Lorimer with the surveyor will meet them by appointment. The party will tour in Khuzistan for about three weeks. Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel with the surveyor will reach Bushire either by land or by sea from Mohammerah about the 15th February.

February 16.—Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel with the surveyor will proceed to Bahrein, and complete the inquiries commenced by Mr. Gaskin. The surveyor will finish his map of the Bahrein Islands. Excursions will be made if possible to Hasa and Katar.

March 1.—Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel will return to Bushire and make local inquiries along the Persian coast from Bushire to Bunder Abbas. Mr. Gaskin, taking the surveyor with him, will proceed direct to the Trucial Chief's coast, and endeavour to arrange for an excursion through the unknown Bani Yas and Manasir country towards Katar. The surveyor, meanwhile, will do what he can towards mapping the interior of the Trucial Chief's territory.

March 12.—Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel from Bunder Abbas and the surveyor will join Mr. Gaskin at Abu Dhabi, and make an excursion to westwards, returning to Sharga about the end of the month.

April 1.—The whole party will march across the Oman Peninsula from Sharga via Mahdheh to Shinas or Sohar, and proceed thence by sea to Muscat, touching at some points on the Batinah coast.

April 12.—Reach Muscat and remain till the 20th.

April 21.—Start from Muscat for Mahot via Wadi Halfen, arriving about the 8th May.

May 9.—Return to Muscat by sea, calling at Sâr, and arriving at Muscat about the 15th May.

N.B.—No assistance will be required from R.N. or R.I.M. vessels till the 1st March, 1905, but it is very desirable that a Government vessel should be available (1) from the 1st to the 12th March for the coasting journey from Bushire to Bunder Abbas, and thence to Sharga and Abu Dhabi; (2) for the return from Abu Dhabi to Sharga about the 1st April; (3) from about the 5th to the 12th April for the voyage along the Batinah coast; (4) from about the 1st to the 15th May for return from Mahot to Muscat: in other words, this programme must be altered unless a Government vessel can be made available from the 1st to the 12th March, from the 1st to the 12th April, and from the 1st to the 15th May.

(Signed) J. G. LORIMER.

October 14, 1904.

Inclosure 13 in No. 45.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Secret.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

January 21, 1905.

PLEASE refer to the letter from your Foreign Secretary of the 29th December, 1904, inclosing papers regarding "Persian Gulf Gazetteer."

Turkish Government have protested, both at Constantinople and through their Ambassador here, regarding the movements of officers in Turkish territory. It is understood that the party have abandoned their proposed visit to Nedjef. In the circumstances they had better give up the visit to El Hasa also; and elsewhere on their tour their movements should be confined to the vicinity of the coast. There was never, I understand, any intention of their visiting Nejd or the interior of Arabia.

Complaint was also made on the 28th December by Turkish Ambassador that marks have been planted at points at a distance from Koweit by certain British functionaries, who arrived at Koweit with five vessels; that tribes near Um Kasa and Kiazimie have been incited by these persons to submit to Sheikh Mubarak, and that the British flag has been hoisted by Mubarak over his palace. I shall be glad to be furnished with a report on the subject.

No. 46.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 23.)

(No. 23.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, January 23, 1905.

MESSRS. Lorimer and Gabriel's journey.

See my telegram No. 20 of the 21st instant.

I hear from His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad that at Hillah officers were treated practically as prisoners, being sent thence to Bagdad under escort of gendarmes with an officer. In view of this treatment, I have made strong remonstrances at the Porte, demanding reprimand of Vali.

I have requested facilities for Mr. Lorimer and an assistant to visit Hasa and Katif, such being their desire, and have represented that if, after what has happened, facilities should be refused, His Majesty's Government will doubtless be much annoyed.

I shall to-morrow cause fresh representations to be made at the Palace, but, as Hasa immediately adjoins Ibn Saoud's country, I anticipate a refusal.

No. 47.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 24.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 23rd January, relative to Koweit and Nejd.

India Office, January 24, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 47.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

January 23, 1905.

POLITICAL RESIDENT in Persian Gulf telegraphs, on the 17th instant, as follows regarding affairs in Nejd and Koweit:—

"Report of to-day's date received from Knox states that arrival of Ibn Saud at or in the neighbourhood of Koweit, on his way to Safwan (where he is to meet the Vali of Bussorah) is now imminent. It is also stipulated that Mubarak shall be present, and the latter is making preparations to proceed to the rendez-vous, taking with him, as a measure of precaution, a formidable escort 1,000 strong. This important event is significant, because expediency of extending British protection to Ibn Saud and Nejd has been repeatedly impressed upon Knox by Mubarak, who represents that such a measure, besides being earnestly desired by himself and his friends before mentioned, is one failing which Ibn Saud will have no alternative but to allow the Turks admittance into Nejd. At the same time, but in a separate communication, Mubarak stated that he considered he ought to be subsidized by the British Government for his services. Impression conveyed by all this is that the present opportunity is being utilized both by Mubarak and Ibn Saud to work on our feelings. Knox, however, has maintained a guarded and discreet attitude. No doubt the Turks will do their utmost at the forthcoming Conference to seduce Mubarak. Probability is that he will not waver, but I should be glad to be informed whether I may ask for His Majesty's ship 'Sphinx,' which is available, to proceed to Koweit until required at Bahrein. Knowledge that a British man-of-war is present at Koweit while the conference with the Vali is proceeding might serve to give confidence to Mubarak or else might prove a useful deterrent. I should also be glad to know whether the Government of India have any special instructions for Knox in case it should be found impossible for a meeting between him and Ibn Saud to be avoided. Meeting will not be sought by Knox."

I have authorized Resident to ask for dispatch of His Majesty's ship "Sphinx" to Koweit, as he proposes, and I have referred him to your telegram of the 30th December for his guidance. I have also given instructions that, unless, of course, Ibn Saud actually visits Koweit, no meeting or communication with him is to take place.

No. 48.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 8.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, January 21, 1905.

THE visit of Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel to El Hasa (see your telegram No. 23 of yesterday) would be inopportune at present, and the Indian Government have been informed that it had better be abandoned, and the movements of the party confined to the coast.

When, as will probably happen, the Turkish Government refuse permission, you should, as a concession on our part, let the matter drop.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Chief Justice Fuller.

Sir, Foreign Office, January 24, 1905.
HIS Britannic Majesty's Government have heard with great satisfaction through the United States' Ambassador at this Court that you have kindly consented to accept the office of Arbitrator in the Arbitration agreed upon between the Government of His Majesty and that of the French Republic to determine certain disputed questions relating to Muscat.

I have accordingly the honour to convey to you the thanks of His Britannic Majesty's Government for your courtesy in the matter, and to inform you that you are hereby appointed to act in that capacity on their behalf.

A copy of the Agreement signed by the two Governments on the 13th October, 1904, for referring the question to arbitration, is inclosed for your information; also a copy of a supplementary Agreement, signed on the 13th January, from which you will observe that the time within which the Tribunal is to assemble at The Hague will not be earlier than the 15th June—an arrangement which, it is hoped, will suit your convenience.

Copies of the Cases, the Counter-Cases, and the Arguments will reach you in due course, as provided for in the Agreement.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 25.)

(No. 25.) Constantinople, January 25, 1905.
(Telegraphic.) P.
MR. LORIMER'S journey.

With reference to my telegram No. 23 of the 23rd instant, assurances have been given me that, as regards his journey to Katif and the littoral, authorities will place no obstacles in his way; it is, however, requested that, as the country round Hasa is disaffected, he will not go to that town.

I have informed His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad of the above.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir F. Bertie.

(No. 52.) Foreign Office, January 25, 1905.
Sir,

I MADE to the French Ambassador to-day a suggestion to the following effect with regard to the Muscat Arbitration:—

I observed that a difficulty would arise with regard to the delivery of the Cases to the Tribunal of Arbitration, owing to the fact that the Arbitrators appointed by the two Governments had not yet had time to choose an Umpire. The Tribunal would not, therefore, be fully constituted on the day fixed for the delivery of the Cases, and it would not consequently be possible to carry out in their entirety the provisions of Article II of the Agreement of the 13th October. It was therefore suggested that each Party should communicate to the Permanent Bureau at The Hague, on or before the 1st February, four copies of its Case. Of these one would be retained for the use of the Bureau, one reserved for eventual communication to the Umpire when appointed, and the remaining two would be forwarded at once by the Bureau to Chief Justice Fuller and M. Savornin Lohman.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, Foreign Office, January 28, 1905.
I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 21st January, relative to the journey of Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel in Arabia and to inclose, for Mr. Secretary Brodrick's information, copies of telegraphic correspondence with His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires on the subject.*
I am to express Lord Lansdowne's concurrence in the terms of Mr. Brodrick's telegram to the Government of India of the 21st instant.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 30.)

(No. 51.) Constantinople, January 24, 1905.
My Lord.
WITH reference to my despatch No. 18 of the 10th instant, I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Damascus, reporting the departure of further troops, ostensibly for the Yémen, and giving an account of recent events in the Nejd.

This is the first intimation that has reached me of Hail having fallen into the hands of Ibn Saud.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 53.

Consul Richards to Mr. Townley.

(No. 3.) Damascus, January 11, 1905.
Sir,
I HAD the honour to report by telegraph on the 9th instant, with reference to my despatch No. 59 of the 24th ultimo, that up to that date some 2,500 troops, most of whom are last year's conscripts, had left Damascus by the Mecca railway for Ma'au, whence they would march to Akaba and embark there for some post in the Yémen, probably Hodeidah.

Of these troops 1,500 men came from Beirut, 1,000 having been landed there for the purpose, while the remaining 500 (in round numbers) are said to be last year's conscripts. As to this, however, you will be better informed from another quarter. Of the remaining 1,000, about 500—mostly last year's conscripts—have come from the Aleppo district, while the rest (500) have been drawn from this district.

I hear that a lieutenant-general (ferik), a colonel (Miralai), and a lieutenant-colonel (Caimmacam), whose names so far are unknown, are now on their way here from Constantinople, in order to proceed to the Nejd with the object of forming a sort of advisory Committee to Abdul Aziz Ibn Reshid, the Emir of that country. These officers are, it is said, to be joined here by two others of the rank of Kol Aghassi (adjutant-major), one of whom is a certain Ferid Bey belonging to the Staff here, while the other, whose name is Mustapha Effendi, is coming from Aleppo, where he occupies a similar position. I am even given to understand that Feizi Pasha, who commands the 6th (Bagdad) Army District, will also proceed to Nejd (if indeed he has not already started) on a special mission to the Emir, but you will be better informed on this point from another quarter.

You will, Sir, doubtless have heard of the capture of Hail by Abdul Aziz Ibn So'oud, the Wahibi opponent of Ibn Reshid. A report has reached me to the effect that Ibn So'oud has made an earnest appeal to the Sultan to support his claim to the

* Nos. 41, 42, 43, 46, 48, and 50.

Emirship of the Nejd on the ground that he is the hereditary Emir, and not Ibn Reshid, who can only claim descent from an usurper, viz., his grandfather, Abdullah Ibn Reshid, the founder, so to speak, of the dynasty. This is undoubtedly true, but it is open to question whether the Sultan could, as a matter of policy, even if he wished, cease to protect the present representative of the Ibn Reshid family.

In view of the conflict now going on in the Nejd, it has occurred to me that some of the troops now supposed to be on their way to the Yâmen may not improbably be landed at Yambô (instead of proceeding to Kunfida or Hodeidah) and marched up through Medina to Hail to the assistance of Ibn Reshid. Here in military circles it is reported, it is true, that Yâmen is the destination of all the troops, but that would be stated in any case. It does not follow that it is true.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. S. RICHARDS.

No. 51.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 30.)

(No. 52.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 23, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad has informed me by telegraph that Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel have returned to Bagdad from Kerbela, via Hillah. Major Newmarch states that upon their arrival at the latter place, the Kaïmakam told them that he had received orders from Bagdad that they must return thither direct without visiting any other place, but that these instructions only concerned them and were not applicable to any other British subjects or foreigners. He threatened force if they endeavoured to proceed, which they had no intention of doing as they had renounced their visit to Nedjef.

It appears, moreover, that during the second night of their stay at Hillah, sentries were posted on the inn where they were, and that they were escorted back to Bagdad by gendarmes under an officer. This they only accepted under protest. Their only object was to travel down the Euphrates to Bagdad for the purpose of procuring information for the Gazetteer of India. Major Newmarch had himself informed the Vali before their departure from Bagdad that their journey had no reference to the military expedition, and I had given similar assurances at the Porte, as I have already reported to your Lordship.

Major Newmarch informs me in a subsequent telegram that Mr. Lorimer being pressed for time, he has instructed the British Vice-Consul at Kerbela to undertake the journey down the Euphrates.

He adds that Mr. Lorimer considers that it is important for him to visit the Katif and Hasa districts, through which the major part of the central Arabian trade passes to and from the coast. He has asked me to obtain assurances that he will not be molested.

I have to-day represented to the Porte in forcible language the impropriety of the way in which these officials of the Indian Government have been treated by the Kaïmakam of Hillah, and I have suggested that the Vali of Bagdad be reprimanded, since the instructions to the Kaïmakam were issued by him. I pointed out that it would have been a serious offence to have treated the officials of a friendly Government like common malefactors at any time, but that the offence in this instance was aggravated by the fact that they had been specially recommended to the Sublime Porte by His Majesty's Embassy, who had given assurances that the object of their visit was purely inoffensive.

I told the Minister for Foreign Affairs that he was no doubt in possession of a report from Musurus Pasha of the answer which your Lordship had made to his remonstrances against the actions of Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel, which you were good enough to communicate to me in your despatch No. 12 of the 4th instant. I said that it was ridiculous to suppose for a moment that the Government of India would send officials on such a mission as that which the Turkish Government professed to believe had been entrusted to these gentlemen.

I then informed the Minister that Mr. Lorimer and an assistant proposed to visit El Katif and El Hasa, and I requested His Excellency to give me an assurance that they would not be molested. I added that I felt convinced that His Majesty's Government would be seriously annoyed after what had happened if any obstacles were put in their way to prevent them from carrying out the Mission entrusted to them. The Minister

took note of my observations, and said that he would communicate them to the Grand Vizier.

I subsequently saw his Highness and spoke to him much in the same sense as I had already done to Tewfik Pasha. When I stated that Mr. Lorimer wished to go to El Hasa, Ferid Pasha at once exclaimed "but that is the Nejd, and we have already said that he cannot go there."

I represented that the part of El Hasa which Mr. Lorimer wished to visit was not the disturbed region, and I expressed a hope that no obstacles would be placed in the way of the execution of his Mission.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 54^e.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 30.)

(No. 53.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 24, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 972 of the 20th ultimo, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship, herewith, copies of two Memoranda by the British Vice-Consul at Jeddah, on the condition of affairs prevailing in the Nejd.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 54^e.

Memoranda by Vice-Consul Hussein respecting Affairs of Nejd.

(1.)

ABOUT a fortnight ago a messenger arrived at Mecca with letters from Bin Saood to the Grand Shereef and the Vali of Hedjaz.

It is reported that Bin Saood wrote to the Grand Shereef that as his Highness is the recognized leader of the Arab tribes and their Sheikhs, so he considered it necessary to make him the channel of all correspondence between him and the Sublime Porte or His Imperial Majesty the Sultan.

He goes on to say that he has no idea of revolting against the Turkish Government, nor to disobey their orders; and as he is the lawful Ruler of Nejd, and he has defeated the usurper, Bin Rashid, he was willing to accept any reasonable terms imposed on him by the Imperial Government and to carry them out faithfully. He also mentioned in this letter that he was sorry for having fought the Turkish troops in Nejd, but as they were helping his antagonist, Bin Rashid, he was obliged to do so in self-defence. He promised to return to any person appointed by the Government all the booty, including guns, rifles, belonging to the Turkish troops, taken in battle with Bin Rashid.

He also informed the Grand Shereef that at the request of his Highness he has allowed the Bassam family to return to their home (Aneza) with all their property, and that the Bassams will testify to the kind treatment they have received at his hands. It is also reported that telegraphic correspondence had passed between the authorities at Mecca and Constantinople.

The messenger has returned to Nejd three days ago with sealed letters to Bin Saood, both from the Vali and the Grand Shereef, but the contents of these are not known.

(Signed) MOHAMMED HUSSEIN.

January 3, 1905.

(2.)

WITH reference to the last Memorandum on the affairs of Nejd, I have the honour to report that I have come to know from the son of Abdulla Bassam, residing in this town, that though Bin Saood has informed the Grand Shereef that he has allowed the Bassam family to return to Aneza, it is not true. My informant has received a letter from Abdulla Bassam from Riad, in which is mentioned that the Bassam family have given up the cause of Bin Rashid, and henceforth will be faithful to the cause of Bin Saood; no mention is made in this letter that the family has been permitted to return to their home. My informant considers that the letter was most likely written under pressure from Bin Saood or to gain his favour with the object of getting freedom to return to Aneza. It is believed the Bassams have not yet left Riad.

(Signed) MOHAMMED HUSSEIN.

January 11, 1905.

P.S.—It is also reported that Ahmed Faizi Pasha has left Bagdad with 10 battalions of infantry, about 1,200 cavalry, and 36 field and 6 heavy guns.

M. H.

No. 55.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 30.)

(No. 57.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 24, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad, transmitting a copy of his weekly Intelligence Report to the Government of India, dealing with the state of affairs in the Nejd, the visit of Sir William Willcocks, and other matters.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure 1 in No. 55.

Consul-General Newmarch to Mr. Townley.

(No. 81.)

Sir,

Bagdad, December 26, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to submit for your information a copy of my diary for the week ending the 26th instant, sent to the Government of India in the Foreign Department.

I have, &c.

(Signed) L. S. NEWMARCH, Major.

Inclosure 2 in No. 55.

Diary of Political Intelligence sent by Consul-General Newmarch to Government of India.

December 20.—On the 20th December the late Vali of Bagdad paid me a long private visit. He is going to command the expedition which is being sent by the Turks into the region known as Kasim, and he told me that his total force will consist of about 7,000 men, of whom about half are coming from Medina, some from Yen en, and the rest from the Bagdad Vilayet. If these do not suffice, troops will, he said, be brought from the Vilayet of Adana. He said that, on hearing of this expedition, both Ibn Rashid and Ibn Saoud had written to him to say that they wished to make peace and would accept the Sultan's authority. He said he did not expect there would be any serious fighting, because his force would be too strong for any opposition. When I asked him how he proposed to feed so large a force, he replied, in a most easy-going way, that he supposed they would live on biscuits or tinned foods; but he added that they might occasionally get mutton, because there are a good many sheep in that country, which, he said, was by no

means so barren as generally supposed. He said the place had some perennial streams coming from the Jabal Shammar, and that in the neighbourhood of these there was some, and might be much more, cultivation. Also, he said, there were several wells and oases in the neighbouring desert.

He was, and has always been, most friendly towards me as far as his limited powers and the suspicion of the Turks would allow. He stayed for a long time, and we parted in the most cordial manner.

December 22.—On the 22nd December, 1904, I paid a visit to the new Vali, accompanied by Sir William Willcocks, who presented to him a letter of introduction from the Minister of the Interior at Constantinople. The Vali promised to give Sir William Willcocks every assistance, and Sir William promised to tell the Vali on his return what he had seen.

Sir William Willcocks intends going for about ten days up to Samara by the right bank of the Euphrates, and to return via the bed of the Nahrwan Canal to Bakuba and Bagdad. He later proposes to go to Hillah to see the canals in that quarter.

Six hundred infantry (Redifs or reserves) left to-day by the Turkish steamer "Mosul" on their way down the river. It is said that 300 of these men are going to the Muntafik country, and 300 to be stationed at Bussorah. These troops have recently arrived from Mosul and Kirkook.

I have heard it said here that the Sultan is pressing on the construction of the Hedjaz Railway in order to secure a terminus at the head of the Gulf of Akaba, and that the ultimate terminus of the railway will be at Mocha.

This rumour may be worth notice in connection with the efforts now being made to strengthen the Turkish authority and position in Kasim and Central Arabia.

December 23.—The Consular Agent at Mosul reports as follows:—

"On Sunday, 11th December, the Redifs (reserve troops) which have been collected from this Vilayet (Mosul) left for Bagdad in four rafts. They are about 300 in number. It is said that about forty of them deserted the second day after their departure, because the Government had not supplied them with bedding and clothing in this winter season. Some say that these reserves are going to join the fight which is now going on between Ibn Saoud and Ibn Rashid; others say that they are going against the Sharif of Mecca, who has disobeyed the Government and destroyed the Hedjaz Railway, and that now the Government will have to overcome the Sharif."

No. 56.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 30.)

(No. 62.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 24, 1905.

WITH reference to previous correspondence respecting Nejd hostilities, I have the honour to report that His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah informed me, by telegram, on the 22nd instant, that the Sheikh of Koweit had written a letter to the Vali of Bussorah, which was supposed to be on the subject of a proposed meeting of Ibn Saoud's father, the Vali, and the Sheikh. On the 23rd instant, Mr. Monahan telegraphed that a messenger had just arrived with a letter from Ibn Saoud's father, asking the Vali to meet him at Safwan, on the Koweit boundary. The Vali, who has telegraphed to Constantinople for permission, will propose another place such as Fao, or somewhere nearer to Bussorah. Ibn Saoud's father is presumably now in Koweit.

With reference to my despatch No. 901 of the 28th November, Mr. Monahan mentions incidentally that two or three weeks ago an order was received to place the Sheikh of Koweit's agent in a privileged room in prison, but that it had not yet been carried out. The agent had already a room to himself.

I yesterday told the Grand Vizier that his promises that the Sheikh's agent should be better treated had not been carried out, and his Highness replied that his instructions had probably not yet reached Bussorah.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 57.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 30.)

Sir,

India Office, January 28, 1905.

WITH reference to Mr. Villiers' letter of the 29th August, 1904, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to invite the attention of the Marquess of Lansdowne to the telegram from the Viceroy of the 30th December making further proposals for the conclusion of a Protectorate Treaty with Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Thani, of El Katr.

2. A copy of the Agreement of 1868 with Sheikh Mahomed-bin-Sanee, on the lines of which the Government of India now recommend that an Agreement should be made with Sheikh Ahmed, will be found in Aitchison's "Treaties," vol. x, p. 138. That Agreement, it may be observed, was not renewed in 1882 when, after the death of Sheikh Mahomed, a request for its continuance received from his son, Sheikh Jasim, was refused by the Government of India on the ground that Sheikh Jasim's relations with the Turks were such as to render an Agreement with him inexpedient.

3. The Government of India submit their present proposal as the best alternative to the recommendation in their Secret letter of the 31st March, 1904, that an Agreement should be entered into with Sheikh Ahmed substantially resembling those made with the Trucial Chiefs, and they apparently consider it essential for the attainment of the object they have in view that any Agreement that may be made should be public, and should not be subject to the reservations suggested by His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, to which special attention is called in Mr. Villiers' letter of the 18th July.

4. So far as the matter can be regarded as a local one affecting only Indian interests in the Gulf, the balance of advantage seems to Mr. Brodrick, for the reasons given in the Viceroy's telegram, to lie on the side of concluding an Agreement with Sheikh Ahmed. But if this view is accepted, and it is held that there is sufficient urgency to justify the conclusion of an Agreement, the question remains whether it would be better to sanction an Agreement on the lines of those with the Trucial Chiefs as recommended in the Government of India's letter of the 31st March, 1904, or to effect a renewal of the Agreement entered into with Sheikh Ahmed's predecessor in 1868.

5. The form of the Treaty of 1868, which the Government of India propose to revise, has the disadvantage of not, on the face of it, excluding extraneous interference, though by providing for the reference of the Chief's quarrels to the Resident, it might be held indirectly to effect that object, and it will be in the recollection of Lord Lansdowne that this was the one object which, in Sir N. O'Connor's opinion, justified our negotiating for a Treaty at all.

6. On the other hand, the form of the Treaties with the Trucial Chiefs, while it effectually provides for the exclusion of all outside interference, involves the exclusion of Turkey as well as of other nations, and would, therefore, be more likely to be strongly opposed by the Porte, and, for this reason, Mr. Brodrick inclines to prefer the renewal of the old Treaty of 1868.

7. Mr. Brodrick, however, would not press the question of an Agreement, if, in Lord Lansdowne's opinion, our general relations with the Turkish Government make it distinctly undesirable to take such action at present.

It will be observed that the Viceroy asks that a reply to his proposals may be communicated by telegraph.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

No. 58.

*Memorandum communicated by the French Embassy, January 30, 1905.**Arbitrage de Mascate.—Dépôt des Mémoires.*

LORD LANSDOWNE a proposé, le 25 Janvier, à M. Cambon que chaque Partie remit, le 1^{er} Février, au Bureau de La Haye quatre exemplaires de son Mémoire, l'un pour le Bureau, l'un pour chacun des Arbitres, et le quatrième pour être remis ultérieurement au sur-Arbitre.

Or, d'après le paragraphe 1^{er} de l'Article 2 du Compromis, les Parties Contractantes doivent recevoir communication de leurs Mémoires respectifs en même temps que les Arbitres. La proposition du Marquis de Lansdowne paraît indiquer l'intention de ne pas se conformer à ces dispositions; mais, d'après les renseignements recueillis par le Gouvernement Français, divers précédents permettent de penser qu'il n'y aurait pas d'inconvénients dans la pratique à ce que le dépôt du premier Mémoire précédât de quelques jours la nomination du sur-Arbitre, et M. Delcassé avait déjà transmis à La Haye, pour être remis le 1^{er} Février au Bureau Permanent, et distribué par lui, dix exemplaires de son Mémoire, dont cinq destinés au Gouvernement de Sa Majesté (ainsi qu'il a été fait dans de précédents cas).

Mais, si le Gouvernement Britannique conserve quelque scrupule à suivre la même procédure, il paraîtrait plus simple, pour ne pas s'éloigner de l'esprit et du texte du Compromis, d'ajourner encore jusqu'à la nomination du sur-Arbitre la remise simultanée des Mémoires.

Il y aurait intérêt à ce que le Gouvernement Français fût informé d'urgence, en raison de la date, des vues du Marquis de Lansdowne à ce sujet.

Le 30 Janvier, 1905.

No. 59.

Memorandum for M. Cambon.—(Communicated to French Embassy, January 30, 1905.)

WITH reference to the Memorandum communicated by the French Embassy to-day, Lord Lansdowne's Memorandum of the 25th instant was only meant to make provision as to the delivery of the two Cases to the Umpire in the Muscat Arbitration.

His Majesty's Government had not intended to suggest any delay in the exchange of the Cases between the two Governments, and copies of the British Case will be forwarded to His Majesty's Ambassador at Paris to-morrow for communication to the French Government on the following day.

No. 60.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 31.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 29th January, relative to the proposed tour in the region of the Persian Gulf in connection with the Persian Gulf Gazetteer.

India Office, January 30, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 60.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

January 29, 1905.

YOUR telegram of the 21st instant. Lorimer's tour in Arabia.

We have sent instructions that visit to Hassa is to be abandoned. Lorimer merely proposes to cross the Oman Peninsula from Sharga (whence he is to start on the 1st April) to Shinas or Sohar, via Mahdheh. There was never any intention of visiting Nejd or the interior. I will reply separately regarding the other points referred to in your telegram.

No. 61.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 31.)

(No. 27.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, January 31, 1905.

DISTURBANCES in Nejd.

Expedition has started from Nedief under command of Feizi Pasha.

No. 62.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir H. Howard.

(No. 7.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 31, 1905.

I TRANSMIT to you herewith attested copies of an Agreement signed by the French Ambassador and myself on the 13th instant,* providing that the time specified in the previous Agreement of the 13th October, 1904 (forwarded to you in my despatch No. 6 of the 21st January), for the delivery of the cases in the Muscat Arbitration shall be extended from the 13th January to the 1st February.

I request that you will communicate this supplementary Agreement to the International Bureau, in accordance with Article XXII of The Hague Convention of the 29th July, 1899.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 63.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir H. Howard.

(No. 8.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 31, 1905.

ARTICLE XXIV of the International Convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes provides that, in cases where Powers are desirous of applying to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague for the settlement of disputes, each Party shall notify to the International Bureau their decision, and the names of the Arbitrators.

I have therefore to request that you will make a formal notification to the International Bureau, in accordance with the Agreement of the 13th October, 1904, copy of which was forwarded to you in my despatch No. 6 of the 21st January, by which Great Britain and France determine to have recourse to the Tribunal for the decision of certain disputed questions in regard to Muscat.

You should add that His Majesty's Government have appointed the Honourable Melville Fuller, Chief Justice of the United States' Supreme Court, to act as Arbitrator on their behalf; the French Government, on their side, have appointed M. le Jonkheer de Savornin Lohman, a Member of the Second Chamber of the States General of the Netherlands.

Article I of the Agreement of the 13th October, 1904, provides that the two Arbitrators shall together choose an Umpire, and the appointment will be duly notified to the Bureau when made.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 64.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir H. Howard.

(No. 9.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 31, 1905.

I TRANSMIT to you herewith four morocco bound copies of the Case on behalf of His Majesty's Government and of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat in the pending arbitration with the Government of the French Republic in regard to the grant of the French flag to Muscat dhows.

* Agreement, January 13, 1905.

These copies should be communicated to the Permanent Bureau at The Hague on the 1st February. One is intended for the use of the Bureau, two for transmission to the two Arbitrators, and the fourth for eventual communication to the Umpire when appointed.

A further copy of the Case is inclosed for your information.

I understand that copies of the French Case will be communicated to you by your French colleague for transmission to me. The copies of the British Case destined for the French Government have, to save time, been forwarded to His Majesty's Ambassador at Paris for communication to the French Government.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 65.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir F. Bertie.

(No. 61.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 31, 1905.

I TRANSMIT to your Excellency herewith five copies of the Case, on behalf of His Majesty's Government and of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat in the pending arbitration with the Government of the French Republic in regard to the grant of the French flag to Suri dhows. Copies of the Brussels Act of 1890 intended to form Annexes to the Case are also inclosed (the copy of the Case, which is bound in morocco, contains in the volume itself a copy of the Brussels Act).

I request that you will communicate the documents to the French Government on the 1st February, on behalf of His Majesty's Government.

A further copy of the Case is also inclosed for your Excellency's information.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 66.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 1.)

(No. 28.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, February 1, 1905.

MILITARY Expedition to Yemen.

Turkish papers of this morning contain an identic communication to the effect that Relief Expedition, after having dispersed the rebels, reached Sanaa on the 29th January.

No. 67.

Sir F. Bertie to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 2.)

(No. 39.)

My Lord,

Paris, February 1, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that I have this afternoon communicated to the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, through the Department of the Protocol, the five copies of the Case on behalf of His Majesty's Government and of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat in the pending arbitration with the Government of the French Republic in regard to the grant of the French flag to Suri dhows, which accompanied your Lordship's despatch No. 61 of the 31st January.

One of these volumes was a bound copy containing a copy of the Brussels Act of 1890. Separate copies of the Brussels Act were communicated with the four unbound volumes.

I have, &c.
(Signed) FRANCIS BERTIE.

80

No. 68.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 2.)

WITH reference to this Office letter of the 12th ultimo, the Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 31st January, relative to the Muscat Commercial Treaty.

India Office, February 1, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 68.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, January 31, 1905.

MUSCAT. Please refer to the letter of the 8th December, 1904, from your Foreign Secretary, forwarding draft Treaty of Commerce with Muscat. Terms of the draft should not be finally approved by you pending receipt of observations which the Foreign Office wish to make, especially with regard to Article XXI as to Colonies.

No. 69.

Sir H. Howard to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 3.)

(No. 15.)

My Lord,

The Hague, February 2, 1905.

WITH reference to your Lordship's despatches Nos. 7 and 8 of the 31st ultimo, I have the honour to report that I addressed a note yesterday to the Secretary-General of the International Bureau at The Hague, communicating an attested copy of the Agreement signed by the French Ambassador at London and your Lordship on the 13th ultimo, by which the time specified in the previous Agreement of the 13th October, 1904, for the delivery of the Cases in the Muscat Arbitration had been extended from the 13th January to the 1st February, 1905.

I also notified M. de Ruysenaers that in the said Arbitration His Majesty's Government had appointed the Honourable Melville Fuller, Chief Justice of the United States' Supreme Court, to act as Arbitrator on their behalf, and that the French Government, on their side, had appointed M. le Jonkheer de Savornin Lohman, a member of the Second Chamber of the States-General of the Netherlands, and I added that the appointment of the Umpire, who, by the provisions of Article 1 of the Agreement of the 13th October, 1904, is to be chosen by the two Arbitrators together, would be duly notified to the International Bureau when made.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HENRY HOWARD.

No. 70.

Sir H. Howard to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 3.)

(No. 16.)

My Lord,

The Hague, February 2, 1905.

WITH reference to your Lordship's despatch No. 9 of the 31st ultimo, I have the honour to report that I communicated to the Secretary-General of the International Bureau at The Hague, yesterday afternoon, four copies of the Case on behalf of His Majesty's Government and of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat, in the pending Arbitration with the Government of the French Republic in regard to the grant of the French flag to Muscat dhows, and explained that one of these copies was intended for the use of the Bureau, two for transmission to the two Arbitrators, and the fourth for eventual communication to the Umpire when appointed.

81

In exchange, I received from M. de Ruysenaers five copies of the Case on behalf of the Government of France in the said Arbitration, which had been furnished to him by the French Minister at this Court, for transmission to His Majesty's Government, and which I have the honour to forward herewith.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HENRY HOWARD.

No. 71.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 6.)

(No. 74. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 31, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of a Memorandum by Mr. Lamb, inclosing translation of a telegram, in which Abdur Rahman, father of Abdul Aziz-ibn-Saoud, renews his assurances of submission and devotion to the Sultan.

The Memorandum with reference to Talib Bey and to the policy which it is probable that he has been sent to carry out in Nejd were forwarded to your Lordship in Sir N. O'Connor's despatch No. 684 of the 26th August last, and the substance of Mr. Lamb's Memorandum No. 422 was contained in my despatch No. 2 of the 2nd January.

As I had the honour to inform your Lordship in my telegram No. 27 of to-day's date, the military expedition under Feizi Pasha has already started from Nedjef. The Grand Vizier himself told me so this morning.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure 1 in No. 71.

Memorandum by Mr. Lamb.

(No. 37. Confidential.)

I HAVE been furnished with the annexed translation of a telegram received two days ago from Ibn Saoud, in which he renews his assurances of submission and devotion to the Sultan.

The expression in the last paragraph about "the coming Commission of Inquiry" may perhaps be a euphemism for Feizi Pasha's expedition, which the Grand Vizier told you to-day had started from Nedjef, but the person who gave me the telegram further informed me that Talib Bey (or rather Pasha, for he seems to have been recently promoted), author of the Memorandum on Nejd affairs, a translation of which accompanied my Memorandum No. 289 of the 24th August last, is about to be dispatched again to Nejd, with the ostensible mission of attempting to reconcile the two rival Emirs, but more probably to assist in carrying out the policy indicated in my Memorandum No. 422 of the 31st ultimo.

(Signed) H. H. LAMB.

Constantinople, January 30, 1905.

Inclosure 2 in No. 71.

Translation of an Arabic Telegram dated January 15 (28), 1905, and signed "Abdur Rahman Saad-es-Saadoun."

MY humble Petition, to be laid, by the intermediary of the Council of Ministers, before the throne of His Imperial Majesty, our gracious Sovereign, Commander of the Faithful, Caliph of the Prophet of the Lord of all the Worlds:—

I am one of the faithful servants of the Shadow of God, whose family, from father to son, has lavished its blood and treasure in the glorious service of the Caliphate. I have no thought or aspiration save that of meriting the approbation of my Sovereign. It is for me a most sacred obligation to contribute the Imperial taxes at their due and

[1516]

Y

proper season, and to serve and assist the divinely-aided troops of the Shadow of God. Only the local authorities, with a view to advancing their personal interests, have misrepresented this weak slave to the Caliph, making him appear a traitor and a rebel. Whereas these same authorities, for many years past, have not ceased to seize and misappropriate the produce of my farms and date plantations, not even hesitating to kill and murder my tenants and collectors, and in order to conceal their own traitorous conduct in this respect they continue to augment their slanderous accusations against myself.

As for the schemes and intentions of Abdul Aziz-ibn-er-Rashid, they are to overrun the whole of Nejd and Irak. Therefore, to further these aims, he sends to Constantinople persons in his service, bearing "dinars" (£ s. d.) and presents, who calumniate those faithful ones who are opposed to his aggressive schemes. These, however, will be one and all known to His Majesty.

I, together with Jasim-bin-Thain, Kaimakam and Head Sheikh of Katr, openly represented my submission and obedience in our telegrams of the 28th November (10th December) last. I am submissive to every order and command of the Shadow of God. I neither follow the instigations of any foreigner, nor am I the means of communication with any foreigner. In fact, under the protection of His Imperial Majesty, there is no seditious agent or medium of foreigners in all these regions. Ibn Rashid's representatives at the capital naturally strive to provoke the wrath of His Imperial Majesty against me, but His Majesty is the judge. He does not desire to persecute his most faithful servants.

If the coming Commission of Inquiry does not establish the truth of my assertions, I once more assure His Majesty that I willingly accept the severest penalty that he can impose upon me. Let the Imperial Justice decide.

No. 72.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 6.)

(No. 78.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 31, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 62 of the 24th instant, I have the honour to report that I learn from His Majesty's Acting Consul at Bussorah, that the Sheikh of Koweit's Agent is now confined in privileged quarters in the company of an officer who is likewise a prisoner, and that he is allowed to take daily walks in the town of Bussorah, accompanied by an officer.

The Grand Vizier has therefore carried out his promise that the Agent's imprisonment should be made as pleasant as possible for him.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 73.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 6.)

(No. 80.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 31, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 27 of the 10th January, respecting the disturbed state of the Yemen, I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Hodeidah reporting movements of troops dispatched to the scene of the revolt.

The reports that reach me show that the rebellious movement is still further developing, and that important posts, such as Jebel Sharki, appear to be about to fall into the hands of the insurgents. The delay in the arrival of reinforcements, and the mutinous conduct of the Redifs who have reached Cumfuda, have caused the question of arming native levies, such as the Yam tribes, to be raised again.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 73.

Vice-Consul Richardson to Consul Devey.

(No. 3.)

Sir,

Camaran, January 12, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report the arrival at Hodeidah on the 4th instant of the Turkish transport "Sakaria" from Yembo with 1,251 soldiers for the Yemen, followed the next day by the hired transport "Minieh," of the Khedivial Mail Line from the same port, conveying 1,170 troops.

The above troops belong to the 63rd and 64th Regiments respectively of the Hedjaz Division, detached for service owing to the serious state of revolt existing in this province.

They have since been dispatched to the interior, with 2 big guns and 120 camel loads of provisions and military stores for the hard-pressed garrisons stationed between Menakha and Sana'a.

The "Sakaria" sailed again the same evening for Cumfuda to bring two battalions of Redifs to Hodeidah, but returned here this morning empty owing to the refusal of these troops to embark. I hear that the men have mutinied on account of detention for over a year in Assyr without pay and with an insufficiency of rations.

The Turkish vessel "Cozlu" also arrived from Cumfuda on the 6th instant, having on board a battalion of 400 Redifs who have likewise mutinied and decline to march to Zaidyia via Salif. These are at present quartered at the northern extremity of the island, under canvas.

I am, &c.

(Signed) G. A. RICHARDSON.

No. 74.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 6.)

Sir,

India Office, February 4, 1905.

IN continuation of Sir H. Walpole's letter of the 17th October, 1904, and with reference to subsequent correspondence on the subject of the violation of the Amiri boundary by the Turks near Kataba, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to transmit, for Lord Lansdowne's consideration, a copy of a letter from the Government of India, stating the conclusions at which they have arrived after considering the full reports of the local officers.

It appears that, though the violation of the boundary was not so serious as it was at first supposed to be, yet the Turkish authorities did pursue certain persons into Amiri territory with a view to arresting them not for any crime, but because they had shown an intention of settling on the Amiri side of the border.

In the circumstances reported, Mr. Brodrick is of opinion that, if the Kaimakam has not been removed in accordance with the pledge reported in Mr. Townley's telegram No. 151 of the 22nd October, the question, so far as he is concerned, might, if His Majesty's Ambassador sees no reason to the contrary, be no further pressed.

Mr. Brodrick is also of opinion that, in the interests of the peace of the border, it is desirable to utilize the present incident to obtain from the Turkish Government an understanding on the following points:—

1. That all communications between the authorities on either side of the border, in regard to disputes in that part of the frontier, should for the present be made through the channel of the Political Officer at Dthala. Future arrangements of a permanent character can be considered when the Government of India reply to the Secretary of State's despatch, Secret, dated the 23rd September, 1904.

2. That additional pillars should be erected where required.

3. That the establishment of villages should not be allowed on either side of the border in such positions as to render it doubtful whether they are in Amiri or Turkish territory. An arrangement to this effect would apparently prevent the recurrence of such incidents as the present one, and Mr. Brodrick is doubtful of the necessity of demanding, as suggested by the Government of India, that the Turkish Government should allow migration from Turkish to Amiri territory to take place without hindrance.

As to the persons whose arrest was accompanied by this violation of Amiri territory, Mr. Brodrick is of opinion that, if the points enumerated in the preceding paragraph are conceded, it is unnecessary to ask for more than their release with permission to settle on whichever side of the frontier they may prefer, but that otherwise their preliminary surrender to the local British authorities should be demanded.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure in No. 74.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Secret.)

Sir,

Fort William, December 29, 1904.

WE have the honour to invite your attention to the correspondence ending with our telegram dated the 11th ultimo, relative to the violation of the Amiri border by the Turks.

2. A copy of the correspondence on the subject accompanies our letter, but, for the sake of convenience, we may here give a résumé of the main facts.

On the 21st September last the Political Resident at Aden reported that, under the orders of the Kaimakam of Kataba, a body of Turks and Arabs surrounded a village, Mazoob Habal-al-Khadar, on the night of the 14th September, and seized, along with their cattle and other property, six Turkish subjects who had left Shakab, a village on the Turkish side, to settle in Mazoob Habal-al-Khadar, which they thought was within Amiri territory.

We may explain that Shakab is a Yubi village, and with most of the Yubi villages was left to the Turks. However, at the Amir's request, in order to give him the west bank of the Wadi Abara or Hapesh, a good deal of the cultivation of this village was left on the British side of the line. Some of the cultivators elected to build their houses in British territory; but, owing to the fact that the boundary pillars in this neighbourhood are about two and a-half miles apart and the country is broken, they unfortunately made a mistake, and built them just on the Turkish side of the line. The action of the Kaimakam was taken in spite of Major Merewether, the Political Officer at Dthala, having the previous day requested him not to do anything in the matter, but to represent it officially, when it would be inquired into and adjusted. Notwithstanding this friendly advice, the Turks not only proceeded against the villagers, but continued the pursuit of those who escaped immediate capture into Amiri limits, and as a result the British frontier so recently demarcated was violated in the raid. There are grounds for suspecting that the Kaimakam acted under instructions from Constantinople, as his powers in matters concerning the British are limited. The Kaimakam stated to Major Merewether that the Amir of Dthala had enticed away the villagers in question from the Turkish village, but inquiries fail to show anything beyond the fact that the Amir had been approached by the men for permission to settle on his lands in consequence of the treatment they were receiving at the hands of the Turks, and he had consented, somewhat readily perhaps, because he had recently purchased additional land.

3. On a consideration of these facts, we desire to submit to His Majesty's Government the following observations:—

(a.) We are in accord with his Excellency the Governor of Bombay in thinking that the present incident should be made use of to obtain from the Turkish Government an understanding that subjects of either side of the frontier shall be free to settle on the other without let or hindrance and without the fear of such consequences as ensued in the present case; and we would point out the necessity, which appears to us to have been established by the incident, of recognizing the principle that negotiations in regard to border disputes between the authorities on the British and Turkish side of the boundary along the whole of the demarcated frontier of the Aden hinterland shall, in the future, should occasion arise, be conducted through the channel of the Political Officer at Dthala.

(b.) We observe from the telegram addressed on the 22nd October to the Marquess of Lansdowne by His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Constantinople that the Turkish Government hold out a hope that the guilty Kaimakam of Kataba will be removed; and we presume that no further action is contemplated by His Majesty's Representative until a reasonable opportunity has been given to the Porte to act in accordance with their implied promise. We earnestly trust, however, that, should the latter show signs

of an intention to procrastinate or to evade their promise, renewed representations will be made with a view to the prompt supersession of the Kaimakam.

(c.) We have an undoubted right to demand from the Turkish Government the preliminary surrender to the British local authorities of the Turkish subjects who were pursued across the border into British territory and there arrested. This right might be utilized with a view to bringing pressure on the Turkish Government, but we do not consider that it is necessary, if the Porte prove compliant on the points mentioned under (a) and (b), to insist on anything more than the mere release of the men and the extension to them of permission to settle on whichever side of the frontier they may prefer. This last demand is perfectly reasonable, since the cultivable land belonging to the hamlet of Shakab lies on both sides of the boundary.

(d.) The British and Turkish local authorities should at once be authorized to make concerted arrangements for prohibiting the establishment of villages within half-a-mile of either side of the border and for the erection of intermediate pillars, between pillars 32 and 33, as well as at any other part of the Amiri border where the nature of the country would make such action advisable.

We have, &c.
(Signed) CURZON.
KITCHENER.
E. F.-G. LAW.
E. R. ELLES.
A. T. ARUNDEL.
DENZIL IBBETSON.
H. ERLE RICHARDS.

No. 75.

M. Cambon to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 6.)

Ambassade de France, Londres,
le 6 Février, 1905.

M. le Marquis,

EN prenant connaissance du Mémoire Britannique relatif aux boutriers Mascatais, que, pour se conformer aux stipulations du Compromis d'Arbitrage, votre Seigneurie a bien voulu faire communiquer à M. Delcassé par son Ambassadeur à Paris, mon Gouvernement a constaté non sans surprise que, d'après le titre qu'il porte, ce document est présenté au Tribunal Arbitral au nom du Gouvernement Britannique et du Sultan de Mascate, et qu'une déclaration dans le même sens figure à la fin de la préface. Une pareille rédaction aboutirait à faire du Gouvernement Britannique l'avocat et le tuteur légal du Sultan indépendant de Mascate: mon Gouvernement se trouverait dans l'impossibilité d'admettre une telle prétention. Le Sultan de Mascate n'a aucune qualité pour intervenir dans un litige qui concerne exclusivement l'interprétation de la Déclaration Franco-Anglaise du 10 Mars, 1862; il n'a point été Partie Contractante à cette Déclaration ni au Compromis d'Arbitrage du 13 Octobre, 1904. Chacun de ces deux actes est pour lui *res inter alios acta*, et il ne peut prendre aucune part, directe ou indirecte, aux débats institués devant le Tribunal de La Haye devant lequel sont seuls Parties la France et la Grande-Bretagne, en vertu de l'Acte même qui a constitué ce Tribunal.

Je suis chargé par mon Gouvernement de vous présenter une observation à ce sujet et de déclarer à votre Seigneurie que nous ne saurions accepter l'introduction du Sultan de Mascate dans la discussion qui doit se poursuivre devant le Tribunal Arbitral de La Haye.

Veillez, &c.
(Signé) PAUL CAMBON.

No. 76.

Sir A. Hardinge to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 6.)

(No. 11.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, February 6, 1905.

KOWEIT subjects in Persia. Government of India's despatch of the 8th December, 1904.

Am I to make representations to the Persian Government in this sense? Russian Z

[1516]

and Turkish, and perhaps German, Representatives here would doubtless persuade them not to comply with our desires, but I could always point out that retaliation might be used on Persian subjects in Koweit, and that, in view of the overland pilgrim traffic through Nejd or Jebel, it is to Persia's interest to remain on good terms with the Sheikh Mubarak.

I might get them to send an informal hint to their officials in the south to refrain from molesting Koweit subjects and dhows, but I think they would most likely stick at formally recognizing our protectorate over the place.

Mr. Grant Duff has already been asked by the Customs Department as to what is the political status of Koweit subjects in Persia, but he evaded answering till he knew what your Lordship's views were on this somewhat delicate question.

(Repeated to India.)

No. 77.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 41.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, February 7, 1905.

THE continued refusal of the Turkish Government to settle the question of the boundaries of the nine cantons in the Hinterland of Aden renders it necessary that the Sultan and his Ministers should be left in no doubt as to the determination of His Majesty's Government to insist on a solution in accordance with the promise made by His Imperial Majesty to the King's Ambassador in September last.

The recent stages of this controversy which have led to the present situation are well known to you and the Turkish Government, but it will be useful that I should briefly summarize them.

In the summer of last year the protracted labours of the Joint Commissioners appointed by the two Governments had resulted in a satisfactory agreement in regard to the greater part of the boundary line between the nine cantons and Turkish territory. Only two portions remained unsettled, namely, the boundary of the Subaihi tribe from Mudariba southward to the sea and the line from Lakmat-es-Shub north-eastward to the desert.

In respect of both these portions of the line an agreement in principle has already been arrived at between the two Governments.

On the 11th August last, Sir N. O'Connor presented to the Sublime Porte a Memorandum containing proposals with a view of arriving at a friendly settlement of these two outstanding difficulties.

In the case of the Subaihi boundary, His Majesty's Government were prepared to cede to the Sultan a considerable tract of territory to which that tribe had valid claims, on the sole condition that those claims should be reserved in case the territory in question should be ceded to any other Power.

Their proposal for the settlement of the boundary from Lakmat-es-Shub to the desert amounted to no more than a request that the Turkish Government should adhere to the terms of the Imperial Iradé of the 13th February, 1903.

On the 23rd September, 1904, His Majesty's Ambassador, who was about to proceed on leave of absence, was received in audience by the Sultan, and His Imperial Majesty then promised that he would, on the following day, give his formal assent to the Aden frontier delimitation.

This promise was not carried out.

Sir N. O'Connor consequently postponed his departure from Constantinople, and during the ensuing fortnight repeatedly pressed the Sublime Porte for its fulfilment in the usual form of an Imperial Iradé. These representations met with no result; and finally, on the 9th October, his Excellency sent his First Dragoman to the Porte to demand a categorical answer. Mr. Lamb was then informed that the Iradé was actually promulgated, and would reach the Porte on that day.

On the faith of this assurance Sir N. O'Connor left Constantinople on the 10th October.

On the 10th October you were informed at the Porte that the Iradé had actually been received, and that it was favourable. Mr. Lamb saw the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs the next day. He was not shown the text of the Imperial Iradé, but was assured by Tewfik Pasha that it was perfectly satisfactory and in accordance with the terms of the Memorandum communicated by Sir N. O'Connor on the 11th August. Mr. Lamb was further authorized to tell you that you could report to me in this sense.

Two days later, on the 13th October, you learned that the Iradé had been recalled by the Palace; you were assured that it was a trifling matter, which would soon be set straight, and you were promised a further communication on the 20th October.

This promise was not fulfilled, and His Majesty's Government decided to dispatch one of His Majesty's ships to watch over British interests on the Aden coast. On the 28th October the Turkish Ambassador called upon me, and assured me that the Turkish Government had no intention of breaking their promise. He stated that he was authorized to tell me that the Sultan's decision would be announced on the 3rd November, and, in deference to his urgent request, I consented to give instructions that the visit of His Majesty's ship to the Aden coast should be suspended.

No announcement of the Sultan's decision was made to me on the promised date, but on the 4th November Musurus Pasha communicated to me proposals from the Turkish Government, which practically amounted to reopening the entire question. I expressed to his Excellency my surprise and regret at this departure from the scrupulous good faith which two friendly Powers should never fail to observe to one another.

This attitude of the Turkish Government was maintained in spite of repeated warnings that they did not realize the gravity of the situation until on the 30th December the Turkish Ambassador communicated to me the substance of a fresh Iradé in terms similar to the note from the Porte of the 29th of that month, which you duly forwarded to me.

This Iradé falls far short of a fulfilment of the promises of the Sultan and his Government. It is obviously based on misconceptions of the geographical details, and it introduces a new condition with regard to the dispatch of troops to the nine cantons to which His Majesty's Government are entirely unable to assent.

On the 9th ultimo I instructed you by telegraph to explain to the Porte the views of His Majesty's Government on this communication. The representations which you have made have met with no response, and I have now to request that you will point out to the Porte that after the long delays which have taken place, and the trouble and expense which has been incurred in this delimitation, His Majesty's Government cannot any longer tolerate these repeated attempts on the part of the Turkish Government to frustrate the efforts of His Majesty's Government to obtain a reasonable and friendly settlement.

You will inform the Turkish Government:—

Firstly, that although the line of frontier described in the new Iradé is obviously founded on a misconception of the geographical details, His Majesty's Government take note of the fact that the Sublime Porte have sent instructions which will enable their Commissioner to draw the frontier line of the Subaihi tribe from Mudariba to Sheikh Murad through Jebel Kuwah, leaving this fort and the village of Turba with the wells on the Turkish side of the frontier.

Secondly, that with reference to the large tract of country, measuring some 550 square miles, belonging to the Subaihi tribe, which His Majesty's Government recognize as in Turkish occupation, they take note of the declaration that the Turkish Government will not alienate any portion of the Ottoman dominions at any time or under any circumstances as a binding pledge to Great Britain in regard to this territory.

Thirdly, that His Majesty's Government consider that the districts known as Dhabiani, Juban, Naawa, and Rubeaten are dependencies of the Yaffai, one of the nine British cantons, but that they reserve a final decision upon this point for the Commission which will delimitate the frontier from Lakmat-es-Shub north-east to the desert, in virtue of the Imperial Iradé of the 13th February, 1903.

Fourthly, that His Majesty's Government will hold the Turkish Government to the pledge given in the new Iradé that no Turkish troops will be sent into the nine cantons, but that His Majesty's Government record their indisputable right to send British troops thither to such places and at such times as occasion may require in the interests of public security, as they have been in the habit of doing since 1837, when the districts in question came under British protection.

On this understanding His Majesty's Government will be prepared to demarcate the line from Mudariba to Sheikh Murad as proposed in Sir N. O'Connor's Memorandum of the 11th August, and now agreed to by the Turkish Government.

Should the Turkish Government raise any further difficulties in regard to the above points, His Majesty's Government will find themselves compelled to decline to pursue further the negotiations which have been so unnecessarily and vexatiously

prolonged. They will thereupon take their own measures for defining the line which they consider it necessary to claim, and for maintaining their rights over the territory included in it.

You are authorized to read this despatch to the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, and supply him with a copy if he should desire it.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSLOWNE.

No. 78.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 8.)

Sir,

India Office, February 7, 1905.

WITH reference to your letter of the 4th January last, transmitting a copy of Mr. Grant Duff's despatch No. 206 of the 30th November last, relative to a serious affray between Arabs and Persians at Bahrein, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to inclose, for Lord Lansdowne's information, a copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 21st January, and of papers received from India on the subject.

It will be seen that the Sheikh of Bahrein has declined to adopt the proposals which have been submitted to him by the Resident in the Persian Gulf for the settlement of the matter, and that the Government of India are of opinion that vigorous action is required. They accordingly propose to request the Commander-in-chief on the East India Station to send His Majesty's ship "Fox" and His Majesty's ship "Sphinx" to join the "Redbreast" at Bahrein, and to insist upon the Sheikh complying with their demands.

In the improbable event of the Sheikh remaining obdurate, they propose to occupy the Custom-house, in which case the opportunity would be taken of giving effect to the suggestion made by Sir N. O'Connor in his despatch No. 168 of the 5th May, 1901,* and the Custom-house would only be restored to the Sheikh on condition that he should accept a British Indian official as Director of his Customs.

With the concurrence of the Marquess of Lansdowne, Mr. Brodrick proposes to approve the suggestions made by the Government of India subject to the following remarks. He would caution the Government of India that, in view of the possibility of resistance, care should be taken that the force sent to coerce the Sheikh is adequate. He is also disposed to think that for the ringleaders the punishment of expulsion or imprisonment might suffice, and that the flogging, to which in such circumstances there are obvious objections, might be dispensed with. How the Tribunal by which they are to be tried should be constituted he would leave to the discretion of the Government of India. In regard to the occupation of the Custom-house, Mr. Brodrick hesitates to approve the suggestion of the Government of India. It is doubtless true that the Customs arrangements at Bahrein are greatly in need of reform, and that the endeavours of the Government of India's Agent to effect this reform have been persistently thwarted; but the connection of these facts with the lawlessness of Sheikh Ali and his Arabs, or even with the incompetence of Sheikh Esa to control them, is so remote that Mr. Brodrick considers it inexpedient to adopt this measure as a portion of the penalty. Such a course would, he fears, give good grounds for the suspicions of our disinterestedness and good faith, to which Major Cox is clearly insensible, and which

* Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received May 13.)

(No. 168. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 6, 1901.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge with thanks the receipt of your Lordship's despatch No. 97 of the 30th ultimo, reporting that the Indian Government has formally recognized Sheikh Isa's eldest son as his successor to the Chiefship of Bahrein, and that the arrangement has been gratefully acknowledged by the Sheikh.

In the uncertainty prevailing as regards the future of this Empire and the political developments in the Persian Gulf, I think that any arrangement that affirms and strengthens the authority of the Indian Government over Bahrein must be regarded with satisfaction. In the same way I should welcome the news that a British or British Indian subject had been appointed Director of the Bahrein Customs. Such an appointment would seem to the Turks a material proof of our authority over the island, and although the Sublime Porte has never up to the present moment objected to my alluding to Bahrein as under British protection, Mr. Wratishaw has reported that the Vali of Bassorah has done so in conversation with his Austrian colleague.

Doubtless the Central Government, if they saw a favourable opportunity, or thought they could count upon the support of any foreign Power in asserting their supremacy over the island, would not lose the opportunity of doing so.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONNOR.

might have injurious effects elsewhere in the Gulf. With these modifications, Mr. Brodrick would support the suggestions of the Government of India.

A copy of the correspondence is being communicated to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure 1 in No. 78.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, December 17, 1904.

IN continuation of my telegram, "Bahrein Affairs, No. 1," dated 12th instant, I have the honour to submit a full Report regarding the recent case of assault by Bahrein subjects upon a German trader at that port—M. Bahnson—the local representative of Herr Wonckhaus, a gentleman with whose name the Government of India are, I think, familiar.

2. Before the ensuing paragraphs are considered, I solicit perusal of the preliminary correspondence in the case, contained in Inclosures 2 to 19. It will be noticed that the two recent Bahrein incidents involving (1) an assault on a German trader, and (2) an alleged attack on Persian subjects by Arabs and negroes of Bahrein, are so far connected in that Sheikh Ali or his rowdy followers are more or less implicated in both; but as the former case has been provisionally settled by me *ad referendum*, it seems preferable to keep the record of it separate as far as practicable from that of the second incident, which may have to be dealt with independently.

3. What transpired up to the date of my return from tour and arrival at Bahrein may be summarized as follows:—

On the 29th September occurred the assault upon M. Bahnson and certain of his employés, by the followers of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed, nephew of the Sheikh of Bahrein. Sheikh Ali himself was also partially concerned.

On that date Mr. Gaskin was still our Representative at Bahrein. He inquired into the matter on the spot, made certain recommendations or demands upon the Sheikh for the suitable punishment of the offenders and reported the ascertained facts of the case and his own action thereon to the Residency on the 1st October.

The Sheikh of Bahrein took no immediate action whatever in the direction of the punishment or detention of any of those concerned, but contented himself with dispatching to the Residency by the same mail a communication in which he took up the cudgels in his nephew's behalf and preferred a counter-complaint against the Germans (Inclosures 4 and 5).

4. In the meanwhile, Captain F. B. Prideaux was on his way from India to relieve Mr. Gaskin at Bahrein, and was met *en route* by a communication from my Assistant, Captain Trevor, instructing him to take up the matter on arrival and endeavour to effect a settlement (Inclosure 6).

It was unfortunate that a case of this nature should have occurred just as one officer was leaving and another taking over charge. Captain Prideaux was naturally obliged to depend on second-hand information, and, at first, arrived at conclusions (on information and premises which he afterwards realized to be biased) considerably at variance with those formed by his predecessor.

I merely mention this fact in order to dismiss it, for it will be noticed that on a closer acquaintance with Bahrein affairs, Captain Prideaux altogether altered his views, and then even went a step further in his conclusions and recommendations as to punishment than did Mr. Gaskin (Inclosure 17).

5. The result, however, of his first impression was that he entered into communication with Herr Wonckhaus (Inclosures 9 and 10), and that the latter, not considering the terms of settlement offered by Captain Prideaux to be adequate, informed that officer on the 30th October that he had referred the correspondence to the Consular Representative of the German Government at Bushire, and would leave himself in that official's hands. This was a course bearing considerable political significance.

The Imperial German Consul at Bushire made no reference on the subject to my *locum tenens*, but addressed the Sheikh of Bahrein direct, and the latter, under Captain Prideaux' guidance, gave him a very suitable reply (Inclosure 16). What, if any,

[1516]

2 A

further action my German colleague took on receiving the Sheikh's answer I have not ascertained. Meanwhile, on the 5th November another complaint was preferred by Herr Wonckhaus against an employé of the Chief's son and recognized heir, Sheikh Hamed-bin-Esa, the basis of it being a similar attempt to impress coolie labour, as that which had given rise to the assault on M. Bahnson a month before (Inclosure 11).

6. Sheikh Isa and Captain Prideaux being unable to arrive at any uniformity of views in the matter, it was agreed between them that it should await settlement pending my arrival, which was expected at no distant date (Inclosure 4 and elsewhere).

7. Meanwhile, on the 14th November, occurred the second incident: that of an affray between a number of Arab and negro subjects of the Sheikh and a section of the small community of His Majesty the Shah's subjects residing in Bahrein for purposes of trade, in the course of which two Persians very nearly lost their lives and seven others were more or less damaged.

The Sheikh, as will be seen from the correspondence, having failed to take any particular steps in the matter, the Persians sent across to Bushire a telegram addressed to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, a translation of whose reply forms Inclosure No. 18; and as rowdiness was still rife in the Manama Bazaar, and the Persians refused to open their shops, Captain Trevor was able to arrange for the dispatch of His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" to Bahrein on the 27th November as a precautionary measure.

Matters were at this stage when I arrived at Bushire from the Karun on the 29th November, and having been posted in the details by my Assistant, I left without disembarking for Bahrein. From this point I think what follows can be preferably related in diary form.

8. November 30.—Arrived Bahrein at noon. Captain Prideaux and the Sheikh came off to the "Lawrence" to interview me. They arrived separately, and I saw Captain Prideaux first for a few moments. I learnt from him that just before the arrival of the "Redbreast" a few days previously, Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed and Hamed-bin-Esa, with their followers, had proceeded together to the mainland, ostensibly for purposes of shikar, and were still absent. Except for this fact, there was no change in the position as last reported, and the Persian shops remain closed.

I then received the Sheikh's visit. After exchanging with him the usual greetings and after some conversation on general topics, I explained to him that having heard of the two recent incidents at Bahrein, on reaching civilization I had come straight over without landing at Bushire with a view to settling them without delay, and was consequently somewhat exercised to learn from Captain Prideaux that Sheikh Ali and his followers, apparently the principal persons concerned, had been permitted to absent themselves from Bahrein indefinitely, especially as it was known that I should arrive in a few days.

In reply, Sheikh Esa assured me that the party had only gone for purposes of sport and were expected back at any moment; at all events, he would at once send a messenger after them and get them back forthwith. I inquired whether it was usual for members of his family to undertake extensive hunting trips during the exhausting fast of the month of Ramzan, and added that I begged he would take effective steps to insure their early return, in order that I might be enabled to settle the two outstanding cases expeditiously.

Sheikh Esa promised to comply, but went on to observe that Sheikh Ali and his followers were only implicated in the first case, and that pending their return could not the second case be proceeded with? He went on to say that Sheikh Ali had had nothing to do with the later incident, and that Captain Prideaux had only heard the Persian version, and suggested that if I would kindly inquire into the case myself I should find that it was all the fault of the Persians.

This assertion as to Sheikh Ali's non-connection with the second incident was inconsistent with the Political Agent's Report, but I simply replied to the Chief that it seemed to me clearly desirable to dispose of the first case before dealing with or even discussing the second.

[Note.—My reason for being of this opinion was that the circumstances in the first (German) incident were not open to any doubt, and I therefore thought that the *bond fide* or otherwise of the Sheikh's co-operation in that case would guide me as to how to deal with him in the second case.]

We then parted, I proceeding ashore to the British Agency at Manama and the Sheikh to Muharrag to dispatch a messenger after the absentees.

9. December 1st.—Sheikh Ali did not return. Sheikh Esa sent to inquire whether he should call at the Agency. I replied that as Sheikh Ali had not arrived I would not trouble him to-day, but reiterated the necessity of expediting his nephew's return, and begged that he would come over on the morrow forenoon in any case, whether his nephew had returned or not.

10. December 2nd.—Sheikh Ali still absent. Sheikh Esa came over from Muharrag about 10 A.M., and we had another lengthy interview, at which Captain Prideaux was present. I thought it was now time to speak to the Chief plainly and to apprise him of my views, as time was slipping by. I told him that I had in the first instance frankly accepted his assurance that his nephew and followers were only out for a shooting excursion and that he could get them back at once, but that this was the third day of my presence in Bahrein, and that he could hardly wonder if I began to suspect that their absence was preconcerted.

I then went on to say that my view as to what measures it was incumbent upon him to take in regard to the German case coincided with those of Mr. Gaskin and Captain Prideaux, namely, that the ringleaders should be flogged; 1,000 rupees paid in compensation; and that Sheikh Ali be compelled to leave Bahrein, subject to approval of Government. Sheikh Esa then entered into a long demur, in which he took up the cudgels for Sheikh Ali, and argued that he had done nothing to deserve such punishment as that involved by measures suggested, to all of which he demurred. This brought the specific question of Sheikh Ali's position in Bahrein into discussion. I reminded Sheikh Esa that I had been some five years in the Gulf, and that from what Sheikh Ali had himself told me at Muscat I had for long been aware of his character and his not unnaturally disaffected attitude. I reminded Sheikh Esa that only six months ago he had, I thought, confided in Mr. Gaskin regarding his nephew's troublesome personality, and had prompted our Representative to address to me a proposal* for the making of a public pronouncement in Bahrein in such plain terms that Sheikh Ali would accept it as applying to his own case, without the necessity of any specific mention of his name. I added that the idea had had my cordial approval, and that it had only awaited the advent of a more senior Political Officer at Bahrein before being taken into serious consideration.

I explained to him that his present surprising attitude in championing Sheikh Ali could only convey the impression that so long as Sheikh Ali's doings affected his own convenience and peace of mind injuriously, nothing was bad enough for his nephew. He was said by his uncle to be disloyal, turbulent, and most felonious in his tendencies. On the other hand, now that he was involved in an obvious offence against Europeans or others under the protective purview of the British Agency, Sheikh Esa and his son and heir were found to take his part and give him all possible support. How did he, Sheikh Esa, think the Government of India would interpret such an attitude on his part after all they had done for him?

In reply the Chief admitted his previous inward misgivings regarding Sheikh Ali, but explained that he did not fear his machinations or secret enmity now in his own lifetime, but rather later on after his demise.

He then repeated the arguments he had employed before in palliation of what had passed, and urged that the whole incident or incidents would be adequately met and Sheikh Ali effectively subdued by my giving him a severe talking to in the presence of his uncle and Captain Prideaux.

I was unable to concur in this view, and after considerable reiteration and further discussion, the Sheikh finally agreed that as soon as Sheikh Ali returned—

(1.) The compensation money of 1,000 rupees should be levied and lodged at the Agency.

(2.) The four or five ringleaders having been produced or identified should be whipped and expelled from Manama.

(3.) That after the above two conditions had been actually fulfilled I should see Sheikh Ali in the presence of the Chief and Captain Prideaux, and should warn him regarding his departure from Bahrein pending receipt of the views of Government. I suggested his either going on pilgrimage to Mecca or on a visit to Muscat, Lingah, or Koweit.

(4.) Sheikh Esa also agreed, if I so desired, to publish a notification prohibiting

* *Vide* this Office letter of May 19, and Foreign Department letter of June 30, 1904.

the custom of "Sukhra" or "employment of forced coolie labour" by the petty Sheikhs of Bahrein.

At the same time he pointed out that he had already warned those concerned on the subject, and that we were welcome to regard it as an accepted fact that he did not recognize the practice in any way.

11. Before separating we agreed that it was of no use our meeting again until Sheikh Ali had arrived, and until the above conditions (1) and (2) had been actually put into effect.

[Note.—It was necessary to decide hours of meeting a long while in advance, as inclement weather made communication between Manama and Muharrag and between the Agency and the ships exceedingly difficult and tedious all the time I was there and impeded our work very much.]

12. December 3rd.—Sheikh Ali did not return during the day, but we heard after dark that he had just returned, and was spending the night with the Chief at Muharrag.

December 4th.—About 8 A.M. a bag of 1,000 rupees was received at the Agency by the hand of one of the Sheikh's men. At 10 A.M. Sheikh Esa, accompanied by Sheikh Ali and his son, Sheikh Hamed, arrived from Muharrag.

In spite of our agreement of 2nd instant that we would not meet until conditions (1) and (2) had been fulfilled, they all obtained ingress to the Agency reception room, and sent word to me that they had come and wanted to see me. I sent Captain Prideaux in to give Sheikh Esa my compliments and to say that the compensation money, 1,000 rupees, had arrived safely, and I was much obliged for it; but that, according to our previous agreement, the ringleaders had to be produced, or all Sheikh Ali's servants paraded for identification before I could have any further meeting with themselves.

Captain Prideaux brought back the reply that it was this question of the production of the ringleaders that they wished to discuss with me; they were willing, it appeared, to pay another 1,000 rupees if Sheikh Ali's servants could be spared the corporal punishment.

As this 1,000 rupees would merely have come out of Sheikh Esa's pocket of course I remained obdurate, and was eventually informed that Sheikh Ali had gone to the town to collect his men. A little later four culprits were produced and duly identified by Mr. Bahnson as having actually participated in the assault on him. I may mention here that, apart from bruises, the latter received a very nasty wound on the head, and narrowly escaped having his skull fractured.

The four men having been brought and identified Sheikh Esa asked permission to return to Muharrag, as it was now getting late, and left his son, Abdulla, with instructions to have the chastisement of the men carried out in communication with me. Before he took his departure it was agreed between us that I would start the inquiry into the Arab-Persian affray case the following morning, and that he would send his son or Vazier to represent him, with instructions to present before me any of his subjects whom I might wish to examine.

After his departure the matter of chastisement was proceeded with, and every possible obstruction was offered. The Sheikh's Bazaar master in Manama, who was the proper person to perform the operation, was sent for, and directed to bring his canes and executioner. He absolutely refused, saying that no canes could be procured, and that it was more than he dared to have any hand in the punishment of Sheikh Ali's men directly or indirectly.

Finally, I was obliged to send to the Commander of His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" for a weapon, and two Arab bystanders or retainers of his own were called upon by Sheikh Abdulla to inflict the whipping.

They were both tried and both endeavoured to make a farce of it, and after one or two futile experiments the services of a blue-jacket were called in as a last resort, and two dozen strokes suitably administered in the presence of the doctor.

The flogging was performed in the public street outside the British Agency.

13. I have now completed the narrative of the progress and details of the case, and feel that an apology is necessary for the tedious length which the relation of them has achieved. Had Bahrein difficulties ended with the present case I should not have thought it necessary to report in such detail. But in order to deal with the second case which I have to report upon in continuation of my telegram, "Bahrein Affairs No. 2," dated the 12th instant, the Government of India will, I think, find it necessary

to take the whole situation now existing at Bahrein into serious review. It is consequently most important that they should be in a position to form conclusions on the detailed facts reported apart from any personal views which Captain Prideaux or I may be found to put forward.

14. As regards the chastisement of Sheikh Ali's truculent retainers, Captain Prideaux and I had plenty of opportunities during the remaining five days of my stay in Bahrein of gauging its effect. I can only say that both missionaries, merchants and others with whom we came in contact were of opinion that in the eyes of all law-abiding members of the Manama community, Arab or otherwise, the punishment exacted had been badly needed, and had had a highly salutary effect.

15. As regards the incident generally I have the honour to point out that when the temporary situation at Bahrein came to my knowledge on the 29th November, I had to regard it from three points of view:—

(1.) That a young European trader of quiet and inoffensive character had been severely assaulted, and that in order to reassure European subjects of our own and those of other Powers for the safety of whose subjects in Bahrein we are morally responsible, prompt and vigorous action was evidently necessary.

(2.) That Herr Wonckhaus' reference to the German Consulate at Bushire had brought into prominent issue the nature of our quasi-protectorate in Bahrein in the same way that French action has recently done in another connection, and that the German Government or any other Government similarly interested would gain an opening for assailing our régime, if they could show that we could not or did not give their subjects effective protection.

I may add confidentially that I find that my active Russian colleague thought the Bahrein incidents of sufficient public interest to send a long wire to his Government on the subject.

(3.) It was evident from the reports of our local officers that owing to the weakness of Sheikh Esa's rule a considerable amount of rowdyism was generally prevalent in Manama, which it was necessary to repress.

16. I shall say more on the subject of Sheikh Ali's future when reporting on the second incident. Meanwhile I beg that as soon as possible after perusal of the foregoing the Government of India will be pleased to instruct me by telegraph to the following effect so far as is in accordance with their own views:—

(1.) That the compensation money of 1,000 rupees may be paid over to M. Bahnson.

(2.) That I may be permitted to warn Sheikh Esa as from Government that Sheikh Ali will not be permitted to return to Bahrein at the expiry of the provisional three weeks' absence stipulated for by me, should it so happen that Government have not been able within that time to come to a decision with regard to him.

The undertaking obtained from Sheikh Esa in this connection forms Inclosure No. 19 to this Report.

Inclosure 2 in No. 78.

Mr. Gaskin to Major Cox.

Bahrein, October 1, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to forward, for your information, copy of a letter, dated the 29th September last, I have received from Herr Wonckhaus, regarding an outrage committed by Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed and his followers in the German firm's premises on Thursday last.

I would venture to report that immediately on the receipt of information I proceeded to the scene of the outrage and interrogated the members of the German firm's staff concerned in the matter, and found the main facts to be as set forth in the above-quoted communication.

I caused Sheikh Ali to appear before me to explain his conduct. He stated that by his orders his servant went out to secure a coolie for his service, and when he got hold of one, the German's native clerk assaulted his servant with a stick and inflicted

several contusions on the man's body and had drawn blood, also he produced a broken cane alleged to have been employed by the clerk.

The man was produced, and upon examination no traces of assault were visible, and the stick was admitted to belong to Sheikh Ali's man, but evidently a scuffle had taken place, and the clerk had wrenched the stick from Sheikh Ali's man and made use of it. The man, however, appears to have been the aggressor by seizing hold of the clerk by the throat, and the latter defended himself in the best way he could.

Sheikh Ali's man apparently took an exaggerated story to his master, whereupon the latter sent after the native clerk to appear before him, but being occupied with the firm's business, he informed the Sheikh's messenger that he would go to him later on. Sheikh Ali evidently took umbrage at the reply, and proceeded with a number of followers to the German's house, and meeting the clerk in the hall, asked him if he had struck his servant, and on receiving a reply in the affirmative, he struck the clerk some blows on the left side of the neck. The Sheikh's followers at the same time seized another coolie on the premises and started hiding him with sticks, and M. Bahnson, an assistant to Herr Wonckhaus, hearing the noise went below, and in the attempt to extricate the coolie, received several blows about his person and head, one of which inflicted a cut a little over 1½ inches long, exposing the scalp and causing the loss of a quantity of blood.

When questioned Sheikh Ali at first denied having struck the clerk, but when confronted with him he acknowledged having done so. Further, he made no attempt to stop his followers from assaulting the coolie on the premises when asked to do so by M. Bahnson, and when the latter endeavoured to protect the coolie, Sheikh Ali tried to stop him from reaching the coolie.

Under ordinary circumstances the incident would not have been considered so serious; but the conditions prevailing in Bahrein are such as to necessitate the adoption of extreme measures for the suppression of similar occurrences which otherwise may jeopardize the lives of Europeans and their employees should they be repeated.

I have been obliged to bring to the notice of the Chief the interference of his men and the attendants of the petty Sheikhs with persons in the service of the British and German firms here on several occasions, and though the Chief has warned the petty Sheikhs accordingly, they do not appear to pay any heed to him.

Unless the servants are effectually protected from molestation the firms will find their employees deserting them to the detriment of their business generally.

I have considered it my duty to put the case before the Chief strongly, and demanded the punishment and expulsion of the men who were concerned in the outrage also a fine of 1,000 rupees. The Chief said he would inquire into the matter and communicate with me later. I trust that you will approve of my action.

The Chief will probably endeavour to avoid doing anything in the matter, as he is a little afraid of Sheikh Ali and his brothers, and it may be necessary for you to bring strong pressure to bear upon the Chief to induce him to punish the offenders.

Inclosure 3 in No. 78.

Herr R. Wonckhaus to Mr. Gaskin.

Bahrein, September 29, 1904.

I AM sorry to have to report to you the following matter:—

This forenoon some of my regularly employed coolies were engaged in measuring shells and in bringing them into my godown; while thus employed one of the coolies was taken hold of by one of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed's men, as Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed wanted some coolies to work for him ("sukhra"). The coolie refused, and ran into my godown, leaving one empty bag of mine in the hands of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed's men, who stuck to it. My native clerk, Abdulla-bin-Ostat Ahmed, noticing this, went to Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed's man, asking him why he did so, and adding, out of politeness to Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed, that if Sheikh Ali was in need of some coolies he might only send to his saheb and he would be sure of getting some, but that those coolies in question were employed just now in urgent work for me, but other coolies were at his disposal if he cared to make it known to me. The Sheikh's man replied he wanted these very coolies and none else, saying this in a very insolent way. Thereupon my

native clerk, Abdulla, requested the man to return the empty bag belonging to me which he had taken forcibly from the coolie. This man refused again, becoming insolent. Abdulla then took hold of the bag, adding at the same time that if Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed was in need of some empty bags, too, he might send to me and ask for some. The man of the Sheikh did not listen to reason, and each of the two parties tried to tear the bag from the other. So far this had happened just in front of my house, but during this dispute about the bag both of them entered my godown. In my godown the Sheikh's man got hold of my clerk by the throat, whereupon my clerk in his turn got hold of the other man's throat, and struck him once or twice with the stick belonging to the Sheikh's man. This stick he had managed to take away from the man during the fight.

M. Bahnson, a European employé of mine, who was sitting in the office upstairs, heard the noise and ran down, succeeding, together with another man belonging to Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed, to separate the two people. M. Bahnson thereupon returned to the office upstairs.

Five or ten minutes after this M. Bahnson was informed by one of my boys that Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed had come into my house himself, whereupon M. Bahnson invited him, through the clerk Abdulla, to come upstairs, which the Sheikh refused. The Sheikh then asked Abdulla, who is personally well known to him, whether he had struck him, the Sheikh's man, and, receiving a reply in the affirmative, he struck Abdulla several blows with his stick—Abdulla crossing his arms and offering no resistance whatsoever, out of respect for Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed—which, according to my personal idea, this man never deserved. I must add here that Sheikh Ali did not come all by himself, but was accompanied by about twenty of his servants and followers, who all of them were armed with sticks.

Some of Sheikh Ali's people took one of my coolies who was absolutely unconcerned in the matter, and gave him a strong hiding in front of Ali-bin-Ahmed. This all happened in my own house, just below the office.

When M. Bahnson heard a noise again he went downstairs, and, seeing that the Sheikh's men were hammering away at one of my coolies in my own house, ordered them to stop, and when this had no effect covered the coolie with his own body, naturally assuming that this would effectively stop their outrageous conduct. M. Bahnson had run down as he had been sitting in the office, without a hat on, and naturally neither carried stick nor any other arms, which in itself should have proved to the people that he had absolutely no aggressive intention. Instead of stopping the beating of the unfortunate coolie the well-meant action of M. Bahnson produced quite an unforeseen effect. The lot of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed's people—about twenty of them—at once started to hammer away with their sticks at M. Bahnson, inflicting among other injuries a nasty cut on M. Bahnson's head 1½ inches long and about a quarter of an inch broad, which produced a very strong loss of blood—in fact, M. Bahnson being covered with his own blood all over the head, face, and chest, the shirt being soaked with blood. During this assault on M. Bahnson Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed pretended to protect M. Bahnson by getting hold of his body and one of his arms, which naturally, instead of proving a protection, only hindered M. Bahnson in the use of his arms, which he was holding up for protection of his head. Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed did not order his men to stop, and, in M. Bahnson's opinion, his behaviour proved that his people were acting under his own orders, and that he, Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed, never really meant to protect M. Bahnson.

M. Wonckhaus, who had been out of the house visiting a customer, received news that fighting was going on in his house, and, hurrying back to the house, found that the people had just left off striking M. Bahnson. On his arrival most of the assailants dispersed, Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed himself, with five or six of his followers, remaining in the house. M. Wonckhaus, having no idea what really had happened, but seeing M. Bahnson bleeding profusely, asked Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed to come upstairs and explain matters, telling him that I would send to the British Assistant Political Agent, Mr. Gaskin, and that it would be well for him, Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed, to have the matter settled through Mr. Gaskin privately. To this Sheikh Ali first agreed, but when being upstairs for two or three minutes he decided otherwise, and said he would go to his own house, and if anything of him was being wanted Mr. Gaskin might send for him—this in a very insolent tone. Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed then left with his followers, and M. Wonckhaus cleaned M. Bahnson's wound and face of the blood and bandaged the wound. Ten minutes after this Mr. Gaskin arrived in my house, and the rest, of course, is known to you.

I have had repeatedly to complain to Mr. Gaskin against the highhandedness of

Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed's and other Sheikhs' servants and followers; and the custom of the Sheikh's men pressing any coolies they happen to meet for work which the Sheikh wants to be done is a highly deplorable habit, which I venture to think ought to be stopped by the responsible authorities once for all.

I do not think it necessary to point out to you the seriousness of the offence committed by Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed and his followers, and I only venture to inform you of M. Bahnson's idea of compensation and satisfaction.

The least which M. Bahnson expects is—

1. The public punishment of the more conspicuous assailants, who are known to M. Bahnson and my clerk Abdullah, who was present. These men will be recognized when the culprits will be brought before M. Bahnson. In order to be sure that the punishment is really meted out to the culprits, M. Bahnson suggests that he should be present at the occasion.

2. M. Bahnson expects a money compensation of 1,000 rupees for the injury received; and

3. I should think it fit if intimation were to be given to all the petty Sheikhs of the island that they have to abstain from pressing coolies who are employed by me for their work.

I hope that you will be able to bring the matter to a satisfactory conclusion.

Inclosure 4 in No. 78.

Sheikh Isa-bin-Ali-al-Khalifah to Major Cox.

(Translation.)

20th Rajab, 1322 (October 1, 1904).

I BEG to forward herewith, for your information, a Petition which has been addressed to me by Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed-al-Khalifah on the subject of the occurrence which took place between him and Bahnson, the German, and to state that I am not anxious that such occurrences should happen, but after it occurred I made investigation to ascertain the truth.

It appeared that the fault was on the part of the German. He has also done further oppression, and I have received many complaints against him which I have not taken into consideration.

When Ali-bin-Ahmed submitted his Petition and produced proofs that he was not guilty, and that the guilt was on the part of the German, I deemed it necessary to represent the case to you because, if such proceedings are repeated by him and others, disturbances will take place.

The decision rests with you.

Inclosure 5 in No. 78.

Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed-al-Khalifah to Sheikh Isa-bin-Ali-al-Khalifah.

Bahrein [undated].

I BEG to bring to your notice that a jolly boat containing some cargo for me arrived here to-day, and I told my servants to land it. They hired coolies on the wharf. One of the coolies entered the building in which the German resides and one of our men followed him to call him, whereupon the servants of the German turned him out and assaulted him.

This news reached me but I did not believe that he will consent that our men should be beaten. I dispatched some servants to inquire into the case.

Ere their arrival on the spot the German's servants came out and began to beat them; I could not keep quiet at that time, and I went to reconcile the parties with a view that no disturbances may occur and that I may not be blamed by the Sheikhs for having acted impolitely.

When I reached the gate of the building, I saw a large number of people consisting of the German's servants, coolies, and the people who work on the wharf. Meanwhile

the junior German, whose name is Bahnson, saw me, came down, and caught me by waist and did not allow me to reconcile the parties.

Indeed, if I did not fear the Sheikhs I would not have allowed him to dishonour me thus.

When I and him were pushing each other, his head was scratched by the wall and there are many witnesses to this fact. If you wish I will produce the witnesses.

I thought it necessary to represent the case to you, and you will not be pleased that such disregard should be shown to me by a man who is well known to be an oppressor, and wicked.

Inclosure 6 in No. 78.

Captain Trevor to Captain Prideaux.

(Telegraphic.)

October 7, 1904.

GASKIN reports fracas between one Sheikh Ali and one of Wonckhaus' clerks named Bahnson.

You might, after consulting Gaskin, inquire into the matter, and, if no settlement can be effected locally, submit a report giving your views and recommendations at an early date, and saying if you concur with Gaskin as to punishment, &c.

Note.

This message could not be sent yesterday owing to press of work. To-day Mr. Mungavin wired, suggesting I should write demi-officially to Captain Prideaux to catch him at Muscat.

I have written practically in the same terms as the message rather amplified to Captain Prideaux, and have asked him in addition whether he considers that if the case cannot be settled by him and the Chief it should wait till Resident's visit.

(Signed) A. P. TREVOR.

October 8, 1904.

Inclosure 7 in No. 78.

Captain Trevor to Sheikh Isa-bin-Ali-al-Khalifah.

October 11, 1904.

I HAVE received your letter dated the 20th Rajab, 1322 (1st October, 1904), regarding the unfortunate incident which has happened between your nephew, Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed and Herr Bahnson, the German. I have also received the version of the incident from the opposite party, and it seems to me that it is very important, in the interests of all concerned, that you should use your best endeavours to settle the matter at an early date in consultation with the Political Officer.

Inclosure 8 in No. 78.

Captain Prideaux to Major Cox.

Bahrein, October 31, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to refer to my predecessor's letter No. 225, dated the 1st October, 1904, with which Mr. Gaskin forwarded a copy of a letter received from M. Wonckhaus on the subject of a fracas that had occurred in the latter's courtyard, and in which he reported the demands he had made to the Chief of Bahrein for satisfaction, and asked for your approval concerning them.

2. On looking into the case myself, I cannot help thinking that the terms imposed by Mr. Gaskin are unreasonably severe, and this opinion I find is held both by Messrs. Milborrow and Zwemer, the other Europeans on the island, and also by all the leading natives of the place.

Before, therefore, mooted the subject at all to the Chief, I have endeavoured to persuade M. Wonckhaus to lessen his demands, but unfortunately without success.

3. Copies of the letter I addressed to M. Wonckhaus and of the reply I received are inclosed. M. Wonckhaus' letter has not effected any change in my opinion. The "Sukhra" custom being such as it is, I do not think Sheikh Ali's clerk was bound to accept the coolie's word that he was in the employment of M. Wonckhaus until it was corroborated by Abdullah. I can find no evidence that Sheikh Ali instigated the assault on M. Bahnson, and if it be conceded that the Sheikh's followers did not strike that gentleman accidentally, their action can still be suitably dealt with by imprisonment.

M. Bahnson is anxious to see the men "sticked" but in a country so much affected by British influence, as Bahrein, I think the punishment of flogging should be countenanced as rarely as possible by ourselves.

Lastly, there is no doubt, I believe, that in this case Sheikh Isa's sympathies are strongly with Sheikh Ali, and that if the payment of a fine is insisted upon, it will be paid solely by the Chief himself. As the latter's impecunious state is well-known, I am inclined to deprecate imposing upon him this form of punishment whenever any alternative can be devised to meet the case.

4. I shall at the first opportunity inform Sheikh Isa that the whole question has been referred to you for consideration, and I venture to express the opinion that if you consider the terms I have suggested too light, they can be most suitably made heavier by the enhancement of the periods of imprisonment to be imposed on the Sheikh's followers or by the latter's expulsion from the islands.

Inclosure 9 in No. 78.

Captain Prideaux to Herr R. Wonckhaus.

Bahrein, October 28, 1904.

I HAVE been considering the case reported by you to my predecessor in regard to which you claim compensation from Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed-al-Khalifah for the assault committed by his servants on your Assistant, M. Bahnson.

Having heard both sides and made further inquiries, I think that the following are the points of importance to be noted, there having been errors of judgment and improper actions on both sides, those on the Sheikh's undoubtedly preponderating.

The first mistake of course was committed when Sheikh Ali's man refused to give up your firm's bag to your man, Abdullah. The latter, however, then erred still more seriously when he endeavoured to recover the bag by force, used language which was calculated to accentuate the quarrel, and ended by striking the Sheikh's servant with the latter's own stick. At this point it will be noticed that M. Bahnson was assisted by another servant of the Sheikh's to terminate the fight, and if matters had locally been carried no further, I think your servant would have been adjudicated to be the greater offender. I have been told that he has an overbearing manner, which in a case like the one under consideration was not advantageous to your interests. Sheikh Ali, however, immediately lost all his advantage by sending peremptorily round for Abdullah, then entering your premises without consenting to see M. Bahnson, striking Abdullah, and permitting his followers to thrash one of your coolies who had no concern with the case, but who was presumably believed to be the original starter of it.

At this stage M. Bahnson committed an error of judgment by going down into the mêlée instead of sending round word either to Sheikh Isa's chief representative on the island or to Mr. Gaskin, the British Political Officer. I do not believe that Sheikh Ali himself had any intention of causing M. Bahnson to be beaten, and it is difficult to say whether the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention. At any rate, it does not appear that the coolie was very much hurt, and the injury done to M. Bahnson's sense of dignity was probably greater than that committed on his person. The fracas seems to have subsided of itself before your arrival on the scene, and the fact that Sheikh Ali accompanied you upstairs indicates, I think, that he was anxious to settle the affair amicably. I presume that he left you before Mr. Gaskin's arrival on getting some idea of the terms which you contemplated demanding of him and because he thought them unreasonable.

The system of "Sukhra" is, as you know, one of long standing—a right enjoyed by all the members of the Ruling Family of Bahrein and other Arab States over the peasant class, and is not to be abolished without the exercise of a good deal of diplomacy or without time. Sheikh Ali's servant has been punished for not realizing that the coolie who started the trouble was your employee by the beating he received from Abdullah.

Abdullah has atoned for his mistakes by submitting quietly to the chastisement given him by Sheikh Ali.

If M. Bahnson had followed the proper course he would not have been assaulted, and therefore I do not think I can support his claim for personal pecuniary compensation, but it is, of course, a very grave offence for an Asiatic to assault a European without just provocation, and I shall insist on the coolies whom he can identify on oath as having struck him being punished by the Sheikh of Bahrein. I think that a month's imprisonment would be the most suitable form of punishment.

As regards Sheikh Ali I believe that a formal apology tendered to yourself and M. Bahnson for his unlawful intrusion upon, and actions on your premises made either before Sheikh Isa and myself at Muharrag or before myself and the Wazier at your house, would meet the requirements of the case.

It is, of course, well understood in the islands that no employés of Europeans can be legally impressed by other persons, and therefore it is not necessary to issue any new orders on the lines of your third suggestion.

These are the views I have formed on the case, and if you acquiesce in them, I think I shall be able to bring the affair to a speedy conclusion. If you are not satisfied, it will be necessary to await definite orders from my superior officer, the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, who will return to Bushire from the interior of Persia on or about the 20th November next.

Inclosure 10 in No. 78.

Herr R. Wonckhaus to Captain Prideaux.

Bahrein, October 30, 1904.

YOUR letter, dated the 28th instant, was duly received by me. I cannot agree to what you say that "there have been errors of judgment and improper actions on both sides." At least, as far as M. Bahnson is concerned, I venture to have a different opinion, and concerning the action of my man Abdullah, I do not think that blame is to be attached to his behaviour.

You yourself admit that the first mistake of course was committed by the man of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed refusing to give up the firm's bag to my man Abdullah. I believe that this was not the first mistake committed by the Sheikh's man; the first mistake was undoubtedly that he pressed a coolie employed by me and that he stuck (*sic*) to him, though he was told in a very polite way by my servant Abdullah that if Sheikh Ali wanted some coolies he might only send over and ask me for some as a favour.

According to your idea, Abdullah "erred still more seriously when he endeavoured to recover the bag by force, used language which was calculated to accentuate the quarrel, and ended by striking the Sheikh's servant with the latter's own stick."

This, I believe, is not quite correct. I should think that if a man takes away property of mine, and be it only an empty bag, he is a thief, and I do not see the reason why a man should not try to recover his lawful property from a thief by taking it away from him, even by force if necessary.

It is not at all certain that Abdullah was the first man to use language "which was calculated to accentuate the quarrel"; on the contrary, he asserts that it was the Sheikh's man who used offensive language and who was even the first one to attack. Abdullah had only touched the bag so far and not the man at all. That in the fight which ensued Abdullah proved the stronger, managed to take the Sheikh's man's stick away from him and struck the man with it, Abdullah quite admits, but I do not think it fair to blame a man when being attacked first, for his getting the best of the fight.

At this point M. Bahnson was assisted by another servant of the Sheikh to terminate the fight, and if matters had ended here, the whole affair would not have been of much importance, and I venture to think that even at this time the balance would not at all be in favour of the Sheikh's man.

If you had been told by somebody that my man Abdullah has an overbearing manner that somebody does not seem to be a competent judge of it. This servant of mine is with me for six years, and I daresay I can claim more knowledge of his character and manners than any outsider, and I can honestly confess that I have never noticed an overbearing manner of his in his dealings with people.

The fact of Abdullah's submitting to the unjustified hiding (*sic*) he received from Sheikh Ali without striking in his turn does not seem to me to bear out your presumption of his having an overbearing manner.

I must say that I, and with me probably most people, have noticed that more or less all the servants of the different Sheikhs of this place do possess an overbearing manner. This fact is borne out by the stories and threats against Europeans generally which have been started by some of Ali-bin-Ahmed's people in these days after the affair.

So much for this less important part of the affair. What happened after this seems to me to be such a serious misbehaviour of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed and his people that I am sorry to say I cannot at all share your views which you formed on the case. Since I have given you all the details of the matter in my first letter to you, and since, from your answer, it appears that you have quite satisfied yourself as to the literal correctness of my narrative, I do not think it necessary to mention these happenings over again; I only wish to rectify some errors of yours.

Firstly, you say you "do not believe that Sheikh Ali himself had any intention of causing M. Bahnson to be beaten." As for this it will not be possible to ascertain what really Sheikh Ali's intentions were, but M. Bahnson, who ought to be able to judge best by the Sheikh's behaviour at that time, and I myself are absolutely unshaken in our belief (which, by-the-by, is shared by a good many people) that Sheikh Ali was the instigator of the assault on M. Bahnson.

If you think "it is difficult to say whether the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention," I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnson has not been hidden (*sic*) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnson affirms emphatically that he has been systematically beaten. The question of it having occurred accidentally is quite out of possibility. What their motives were I myself have no doubts. I do not believe either that it was caused by "exasperation at his intervention."

The large wound which M. Bahnson sustained in this assault luckily did not prove to be of serious consequences, but I can assure you that all the same M. Bahnson lost pounds and pounds of blood; in fact, before I bandaged his wound, M. Bahnson, on account of loss of blood when lying in the easy chair, nearly fainted; but still, I agree with you that his "sense of dignity was even more seriously hurt." If it appears to you that the coolie was not very much hurt, I and everybody with me, who saw the man, will be of different opinion.

The man was sick afterwards and was laid up for more than a week, being unable to work, and even now he is unable to do heavy work he had to do before the assault.

The fracas had just subsided when I arrived on the scene, and it is quite true that Sheikh Ali accompanied me upstairs; but if you conclude from that that he left me again "on getting some idea of the terms which you contemplated demanding of him" and that he thought them unreasonable, you are mistaken, since neither I nor anybody else spoke a single word to him about terms or compensation or anything of that sort. I invited him to sit down, which he did for about a minute or two, whilst I bandaged M. Bahnson's wound. I only addressed him with a few words, asking him to tell me how the matter had come about. It was only when Mr. Gaskin had arrived in my house that the question of compensation or terms was raised by Mr. Gaskin by addressing M. Bahnson, and it was only then that the proposed terms were fixed. I may add here that when the Sheikh was spoken to by Mr. Gaskin his behaviour was of such a kind as to show clearly that he did not regret the affair at all, and Mr. Gaskin himself remarked "he is not at all apologetic."

While Sheikh Ali was sitting down I sent a second man to Mr. Gaskin to inform him, the first messenger having been sent by Abdullah before M. Bahnson went downstairs, but was overtaken by the second one.

When the Sheikh heard me mention Mr. Gaskin's name he got angry and left, in spite of my invitations to wait until Mr. Gaskin had arrived; on the contrary, he said if anything was wanted of him they would know where to find him.

Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed's behaviour after having come upstairs with me was not at all apologetic; in fact, he did show an overbearing manner at that time.

I now come to what you call "an error of judgment committed by M. Bahnson by going down into the mêlée." When M. Bahnson heard the row downstairs it was his duty to go down and to see what was going on in my house. When coming downstairs he saw that an innocent coolie employed by me was being brutally beaten by several of Sheikh Ali's men; it was again his duty to interfere and tell them to stop this; or do you expect M. Bahnson or me to quietly look on when an employé of mine, who is absolutely innocent, is being brutally maltreated in my own house by a set of people who entered my house without my consent?

I think some blame might have attached to M. Bahnson if he had tried only to touch any of these people or if he had only used strong language, but nothing of this was done by M. Bahnson. He simply asked them to stop immediately and stretched his arms over the unfortunate coolie, naturally presuming that this would effectively stop the proceeding. I fail to see where the error of judgment on M. Bahnson's part comes in. It appears to me that you seem to think very lightly about Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed and his followers and his servants entering my house without my consent, and behaving as if he had a right to let my employés be beaten by himself and his servants. If Sheikh Ali thought, after the first affair between his man and Abdullah had happened, that he had reason to complain, he ought to have followed another course which was open to him either by informing me of it, by settling the matter amicably, or by directing himself to the Chief of Bahrein. Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed's high-handedness in the first instance alone is the real cause of the unfortunate affair, and I venture to say that if he is not made to pay dearly for it some way or the other this time, in future his respect for all Europeans generally will be nil, and this might lead to further occurrences of a similar kind, if not worse.

I thank you very much for what you say regarding the "Sukhra" system. It does not contain any point which has not been known to me since long.

Of course, it is "well understood in the islands that no employé of Europeans can legally be impressed by other persons"; but, if it is so well understood, why do these things always and ever happen again?

I myself have had to complain of it several times to your predecessor, Mr. Gaskin, and more than a dozen times it has happened, and I have not troubled anybody with it because I got tired to complain always of such more trifling matters which nevertheless are very annoying and can lead to serious consequences, as shown by this affair. I venture to say it is not good enough that everybody in the islands only understands that European employés are free of "Sukhra," but the people, especially the servants of all the Sheikhs of the islands, must be made to obey, and if they do not, they ought to be punished somehow.

The opinion which you have formed on the case and the terms you propose are so widely different from what I think to be right, that I fear that an understanding about this matter between you and myself will be very difficult. I therefore propose to send in by this mail to the German Consul in Bushire the correspondence regarding the affair, and I shall put the whole matter into his hands for settlement.

Inclosure 11 in No. 7.

Herr R. Wonekhaus to Captain Prideaux.

Bahrein, November 5, 1904.

WITH reference to my letter dated the 30th October, I regret that I have to report to you another case regarding the "Sukhra" which happened to-day.

My coolies were employed in bringing wood from the boat into my godown when a man of Sheikh Hamad-bin-Isa got hold of one of them, struck him when the coolie refused to come along with him, stating that he was working for me.

The coolie succeeded to get the man of the Sheikh to come into my godown, where my man Abdunabi told the Sheikh's man that the coolie was employed by me, and that he might look out for another one. But even now the Sheikh's man did not want to leave the coolie alone, and it was necessary that M. Bahnson himself told the Sheikh's man accordingly.

Of course, the matter is important enough to complain about it but I only want to show you that it is not at all understood that my coolies cannot be taken by the Sheikh's man, i.e., that the Sheikh's people in any case do not act accordingly.

[1516]

2 D

I do not doubt that some of the Sheikhs have the good will not to take my coolies, but I know that the servants and followers of the Sheikhs do not mind it at all.

It is, of course, of no consequence, but I only want to state that the Sheikh's man showed an overbearing manner by speaking loudly and big and even mentioned to my clerk, Abdunabi, that he would complain to the Sheikh about him and about me. In fact, he acted as if he thought to be in his right by taking the coolie although the same was employed by me.

This showed again how little the Sheikh's people grasp the situation.

Inclosure 12 in No. 78.

Captain Prideaux to Sheikh Isa-bin-Ali-al-Khalifah.

Bahrein, November 7, 1904.

I RECEIVED a letter from M. Robert Wonckhaus, the German, complaining that on the 5th instant one of Sheikh Hamad-bin-Isa's servants was forcibly trying to take away one of the German's coolies while the man was bringing wood from a boat to the German's godown; that on the coolie refusing to follow the Sheikh's man the latter struck him and followed him up to the German's godown, where the German's man, Abdunabi, told Sheikh Hamad's servant that the coolie was in the service of the German, but he would not hear of it, and did not leave the coolie alone until he was told to do so by M. Bahnson.

To prevent similar regrettable incidents in future, I request that orders may be re-issued to all the Sheikhs and Amirs to the effect that no coolies in the employ of Europeans can be forcibly taken away by any one.

The system of "Sukhra" is regarded, as you may well understand, by the British Government as objectionable in the same manner as is slavery.

Every instance which brings to notice the oppression entailed by this system must, therefore, ultimately affect the interests of the persons who profit by its existence, and this fact, I think, might well be instilled into their minds.

Inclosure 13 in No. 78.

Sheikh Isa-bin-Ali-al-Khalifah to Captain Prideaux.

Bahrein, November 10, 1904.

I RECEIVED your letter. You state that M. Wonckhaus wrote to you on the 5th instant that my son's servant was trying to take away forcibly one of the German's coolies, and that, on the coolies refusing to obey, the servant struck him.

I have now to inform you that orders were long ago issued to the Sheikhs and Amirs forbidding them to impress coolies in the service of the German as well as of others of similar standing.

The Germans as well as others of similar position have no authority whatever over the poor coolies that work along the sea-shore, and when they are taken for work by the Sheikh's servants they are paid their hire. I do not, however, desire that they should be taken forcibly.

I understand that M. Bahnson invents these stories for your information.

I do not like all these things as much as you would not like them. I hope you will not take these complaints as true.

Inclosure 14 in No. 78.

Captain Prideaux to Herr R. Wonckhaus.

Bahrein, November 10, 1904.

WITH reference to your letter dated the 5th instant, I have the honour to inform you that the Chief of Bahrein, in reply to a letter I wrote to him on the subject of the recent action of Sheikh Hamad's servant, has stated that he does not recognize the

custom of "Sukhra," and that he cannot believe that any one of his relatives or officials would ever contemplate impressing your coolies.

I am hopeful that my letter will have the effect of saving you from further annoyance on this point.

Inclosure 15 in No. 78.

German Consul at Bushire to Sheikh Isa-bin-Ali-al-Khalifah.

(Translation.)

October 19, 1904.

I HAVE been lately informed that the servants and coolies of Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Ali, your nephew, struck M. Bahnson, a German, in the service of Herr R. Wonckhaus at Bahrein on the head, inflicting a severe cut, but that up to now you have not punished the culprits. I therefore request you to inquire into the affair, with a view to compensating M. Bahnson at an early date and punishing the offenders with a flogging before the public.

Inclosure 16 in No. 78.

Sheikh Isa-bin-Ali-al-Khalifah to German Consul at Bushire.

(Translation.)

November 7, 1904.

I RECEIVED your letter, dated the 19th October, 1904, and learnt that you have been informed of the dispute between my nephew, Ali-bin-Ahmed, and M. Bahnson, the German.

I have now to inform you that this matter is before the British Government, and I cannot say anything on the subject.

Inclosure 17 in No. 78.

Captain Prideaux to Major Cox.

(Extract.)

Bahrein, November 17, 1904.

TO console himself for the slight which he considers put upon himself, Sheikh Ali has formed round his person a body-guard of big men, mostly negroes, who are a terror to all quietly disposed residents in the Bazaar and whom I believe no man in the Chief's entourage dare touch. Nearly all the men who are implicated in the Bahnson affair have now also taken part in this more recent case. It may be that Sheikh Isa is unwilling to see the family dignity injured through the punishment even of a nephew who is disloyal to himself, but I firmly believe now that my predecessor, Mr. Gaskin's view, also is correct that the Chief dare not attempt to exercise authority over Sheikh Ali.

The fact that Sheikh Ali is disloyal at any rate in thought to his uncle is proved by his saying to me when he called at the Agency to welcome my arrival that it he had the share in the Government, which his father had held, he would be happy to use his influence towards the proper reformation of the Customs administration.

12. I now have to make the following recommendations. In the absence of a British gun-boat it is certain that no punitive measures will be submitted to by Sheikh Ali and his gang either in the Wonckhaus case or the present one. I hope that as quickly as possible a gun-boat may be sent here, and, if possible, allowed to remain here during the month of Ramzan, as I am not too confident that even the Hindu community will be safe much longer.

13. I think that on the arrival of the man-of-war Sheikh Ali should be summoned on board with all his male servants. M. Bahnson might be invited on board and asked to identify the men who were concerned in the assault on himself. All such who may be known to have taken part also in the later affair should be soundly flogged on board, then sent to Muharrag for one year's imprisonment and then expelled from the islands, in the event of security for good behaviour not being forthcoming. I think such action on our part as this is justified by the Chief's weakness and actively wrongful attitude.

14. Sheikh Ali should be banished from Bahrein and preferably made to reside at Aden for at least 10 years. His brothers can administer his properties and remit him the proceeds. The old "Government House" should, however, be made over at a valuation to the Chief for the use of his son Sheikh Hamad.

15. Finally, Sheikh Isa, I think, should be told emphatically that no disputes between Shi'ahs and Sunnis are henceforth to be referred to the Sheria Court, any more than disputes between Hindus and Mahomedans are. The Shi'ahs who are mostly Persians, in the absence of the Shah's Consular representatives, naturally look to us for protection, and as the British Government are interested in the welfare of all classes in Bahrein, they cannot view with equanimity the injustice even of making Bahreini Shi'ahs (who are all Persians by origin) submit to the jurisdiction of a religious Court other than their own. All such cases should be adjudicated upon by the Chief himself or by an impartial Mejlis.

Inclosure 18 in No. 78.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh to the Persian Traders in Bahrein.

(Translation.)
(Telegraphic.)

Tehran [undated].

I RECEIVED your telegram regarding the assault on you by the Bahrein Arabs. Keep yourselves calm, for I have had a long talk with the British Minister on the subject, and I am sure he will take early steps to get the affair settled and get the culprits punished.

Inclosure 19 in No. 78.

Undertaking given to Resident by Sheikh of Bahrein, dated 28 Ramzan, 1322.

(Translation.)

I, SHEIKH Isa-bin-Ali-al-Khalifah, urge that my personal self-respect and that of my family will be broken if Sheikh Ali is compelled to leave Manama immediately before the Ramzan Eed, which will be only three days hence. But I hereby give the most solemn undertaking possible that within seven days after the departure of Major Cox from Bahrein, Sheikh Ali and his followers shall also leave Bahrein for change of air and shall remain away from Bahrein until such time as Major Cox shall receive a reply from Government, and if no such reply or instructions shall arrive up to three weeks (a month in all) Sheikh Ali shall be at liberty to return to Bahrein.

And if the Resident will accept this arrangement, I promise and undertake to place special guards on the Bazaar, day and night, to such an extent as will satisfy Captain Prideaux, the Political Agent, so that there may be no possibility of a recurrence of rowdiness for the future.

Inclosure 20 in No. 78.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, December 17, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to submit the further report advised in my telegram "Bahrein Affairs, No. 2," dated the 12th December, and referring to the reported attack by a mob of Arabs and negroes upon certain subjects of His Majesty the Shah, residing in Bahrein for the purposes of trade.

2. Before commenting upon the correspondence forming the inclosures to this communication, I venture to record a few facts, or observations, which may perhaps be necessary to elucidate the general situation at Bahrein.

The population of the islands is composed of two distinct but equally important elements, namely:—

(a.) Sunni Mahomedans—Arabs with a sprinkling of negroes, keeping up a constant and more or less migratory connection with the Arabs of the mainland. Among these is the family of the Ruling Chief which is of the Uttoobee tribe.

(b.) Shi Mahomedans, namely, "Bahreinis": that is, the old Bahrein stock, of somewhat uncertain origin. Out of the total island population, which, if I remember right, is estimated at about 70,000 souls, the proportion of the two denominations is about equal, the Bahreins being a little in the majority.

In the population of Manama are included between 50 and 100 Persian subjects engaged in unpretentious trade and mostly owning small shops in the Bazaar. They are, I need hardly mention, of the Shia persuasion.

It will be realized that they form an infinitesimal part of the Manama community and like our own Indian traders, were it not for the measure of Pax Britannica which the presence of a British Representative assures to them, they could hardly trade or reside in complete security in such surroundings even at ordinary times.

3. Chiefest among these Persians is one Haji Abdul Nabi, who conducts the cargo-landing business on behalf of the person who "farms" the monopoly for that work from the Sheikh, namely, the Vazier Abdurrahman. For some months past the said Vazier has been away on the Mecca Pilgrimage, and during his absence Abdul Nabi has conducted the work with full powers from his principal.

He is also employed to some extent by Messrs. Gray, Paul & Co., and is at the same time the authorized contractor for the provisioning of British men-of-war when stationed at Bahrein. Abdul Nabi may be neither more nor less scrupulous than others of his stamp, but the British India Company's Agent informed me that from their point of view he is a satisfactory man, and that during his conduct of the cargo-landing business, they had experienced much less of the petty thieving from packages of merchandize in transit, which had formerly been very prevalent.

Three months ago it appears that this Abdul Nabi had personally traced and run to earth a gang of Arab house and boat thieves, and had brought about the discovery of a quantity of stolen goods at their lodging. Eight Arabs were in consequence imprisoned, of whom five were subsequently released and three still remain in confinement. In consequence of this occurrence Haji Abdul Nabi went for some days afterwards in fear of his life, and though that apprehension had gradually passed off, he was well aware at the time that the present incidents arose that he was not a *persona grata* among the less law-abiding members of the Arab population of Manama, in which category it seems that Sheikh Ali and his retainers had come to occupy a predominant position.

4. Having got thus far I may well leave Captain Prideaux' original report to furnish the details of the fracas which occurred on the 14th November last.

In this communication he states clearly the details of what occurred as ascertained immediately afterwards from the best sources of information available; and his account receives circumstantial corroboration from the testimony of Dr. Thoms of the American Mission, who attended to the injured. I think it may be accepted at all events as placing the incident in the light in which it was presented the following morning to every "man in the street" not actually concerned in it, and except in one or two minor matters of detail, I have little doubt that it represents the correct version of what took place.

5. It was obviously useless to expect any of the injured members of the small Persian community to testify openly to the names of persons whom they had recognized in the mob, for fear of subsequent consequences to themselves, but Captain Prideaux, making inquiries from them and others confidentially, ascertained the names and identity of some twenty-five persons who had been recognized among the mob. Among these were several retainers of Sheikh Ali, some of whom had been concerned in the assault upon the German trader a short time before.

There can be no doubt that the origin of the disturbance was a pure accident and in no way connected with religion; when once started the attack was extended to the unpopular Abdul Nabi and his family and employes, and eventually the religious cry was taken up, and every "Mogul" who was unfortunate enough to appear on the scene was immediately set upon and beaten.

6. After the occurrence those Persians who had shops in the Bazaar closed them, and fearing from the Sheikh's attitude that he did not intend to listen to Captain Prideaux but would try and get their case hurried before the local Sunni Shariat, they sent over a telegram to His Majesty the Shah asking for support. The Mushir-ed-Dowleh replied that the British authorities had undertaken to see justice done. Meanwhile, Captain Trevor, my First Assistant, was able to secure the dispatch of His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" to Manama pending my arrival there.

7. On reaching Bahrein on the 30th November, I found that the Persian shops were still closed, and that the only development since the Political Agent's letter of the 19th November (Inclosure No. 26) was the departure of Sheikh Ali and his entourage,

including many of the rowdies "wanted," for a hunting excursion on the mainland behind Bahrein.

As I mentioned in my report on the assault upon the German subject, Sheikh Isa's attitude led me to anticipate some difficulty in settling the second case, and I feared that if both were handled together, the first case might be buried in conjunction with it. I therefore decided to abstain from intervention in the matter of the Sunni-Shia affray until I had done what I could in the German case.

The latter occupied me till the evening of the 4th December.

December 4.—On that afternoon when I told Sheikh Isa that I was now ready to take up the inquiry in the second case and make the investigation which he had invited me to do, he produced from his pocket a testimony paper ("Istishhad") executed by one of the two chief Sunni Mullahs in which a number of persons purported to have testified that they had seen Persians beating Arabs.

In handing me this document the Chief said that this was the testimony and complaint of his Arab subjects, and he begged that I would see justice done. I replied that the "Istishhad" was of little use to me by itself and that I should want to see all the persons mentioned in it and examine them. He acquiesced, and it having been decided that I should start the inquiry at 8 A.M. next morning, he promised to keep his younger son Abdullah in Manama with instructions to send to me any of his subjects whom I might wish to examine, and to depute his elder son or his acting Vazier to represent him at the proceedings.

8 December 5.—The Persian witnesses who had been directed to present themselves were ready at the appointed time 8 A.M., but I was kept waiting 2½ hours for the Sheikh's representative. Eventually Sheikh Hamed, the son, and the acting Vazier Shereideh put in an appearance, and the former intimated that Shereideh had been deputed to attend on the Chief's behalf. For Shereideh see correspondence ending with this Office of the 4th March, 1901.

He went on to say, however, that it would not be practicable for Arab witnesses to present themselves for examination by me, for in the first place they would not appear in the presence of the Shias and in the second they were dismayed by the punishment awarded to Sheikh Ali's servants the day before. I endeavoured to explain to Sheikh Hamed the sanctity of a British Court and the unreasonableness of this attitude, pointing out that his father had particularly asked me to make this personal inquiry, and now that I was beginning to do so he refused to send me the men whom I might want to see.

I failed, however, to make any impression upon his ignorant obstinacy and finally told him that I could not afford to waste more time and must at any rate get on with examination of the Persians to-day and would like to interview his father on the morrow as provisionally arranged, both in order to pronounce the warning to Sheikh Ali in his presence regarding his departure from Bahrein, and then to show him (Sheikh Isa) the results of to-day's inquiries into the Arab-Persian case.

Hamed then returned to Muharrag and the Vazier Shereideh remained while I recorded the statements of the Persian sufferers. I gave him every opportunity to put questions and cross-examine, and his behaviour gave me no cause to complain.

Copies of statements accompany (Inclosure 27) and I request perusal of them, but in view of what follows it seems unnecessary to discuss the details of them at this point, and I will therefore dismiss them with the observation that in most cases the wounds and injuries of the witnesses and the medical evidence afforded corroboration of the general truth of their story and proof of the severity of the attack made upon them.

9. The examination of these witnesses took me till late in the evening.

December 6.—Next morning Captain Prideaux and I visited Sheikh Isa. He being an old man and feeling discomfort from the cold wind and sea on the journey over from Muharrag, we had offered to visit him instead of asking him to come over again.

His two sons and Sheikh Ali were present, and after the exchange of greetings with the Sheikh, I proceeded to explain my views to Sheikh Ali as to the necessity of his leaving Bahrein forthwith with his unruly followers.

He replied that he had no other course open to him than to accept such arrangements as Sheikh Isa and I might come to with regard to him.

Thereupon the Chief proceeded to speak stoutly in defence of his nephew, but how far his attitude was genuine and how far assumed in order to save his face before his nephew I am unable to say. The drift of his arguments was that his nephew had been

sufficiently punished by the fine of 1,000 rupees and the flogging of his servants, and that he had done nothing to deserve the disgrace of expulsion and was entirely under his uncle's orders. (As to the fine, I fear it must have been paid by Sheikh Isa himself.)

After some concessions on either side, he was at last induced to accept the draft, written on the spot, of the undertaking which forms Inclosure 1 of my previous Report dated the 17th December, 1904 and which provided that Sheikh Ali should remain for the Eed, and then absent himself and his entourage for three weeks pending receipt of the orders of the Government of India.

10. This matter having been disposed of, we went on to discuss the Arab-Persian affray case.

I referred to Sheikh Hamed's intimation of the day before to the effect that Arabs would not be sent to me for examination, and endeavoured to explain to Sheikh Isa, as I had to his son, the unreasonableness of his attitude. I went on to say that I had now heard all the Persian statements, which were fully borne out by their wounds (one of the sufferers being an old man of 80, who was nearly battered to death), and that, as he would not let me examine the Arabs, I must form my opinion on the evidence available to me, and all that now remained for me to do was to explain my ideas as to the steps which should be taken to punish the offenders and compensate the sufferers, and discuss them with the Sheikh with a view to their being carried out. I then indicated to Sheikh Isa what my views were. (See Inclosure 30.)

At the same time I explained that while these were my personal views, I was quite ready, as long as I found him prepared to do substantial justice in some form, to meet him half-way in any reasonable suggestion; or to refer his proposals to Government.

In reply, he proceeded to fall back again upon the argument that I had only listened to the Persian version, and had not accepted the statement of the Arabs as recorded in the Istishhad which he had given me. Again I explained to him that such an Istishhad, drawn up as it was by a Sunni Mullah, could not be accepted by any British Court or officer, unattested or unsupported, and without an opportunity of cross-examining the persons mentioned therein, and that this opportunity he had at the last minute refused to give me.

After some argument he ended by saying that he was now willing to send to me all the eye-witnesses for examination, but could not agree to send any person who had been concerned in the affray itself.

I knew very well that if these witnesses came now they would come thoroughly primed as to what to say; at the same time I did not think it was advisable to give the Sheikh any excuse for saying that I had refused any advance of his, and therefore expressed my willingness to hear any one whom he sent me on the morrow, and asked him to send his representative as before. We then took leave.

11. December 7.—Sheikh Ahmed and Shereideh duly presented themselves, together with the persons mentioned on the Istishhad. I proceed to examine them. Sheikh Hamed was very obstructive at first. I had given him a seat on my right facing the witnesses, and he seemed to imagine that I was going to let each witness rattle off the statement he had come prepared with, and when I proceeded to elicit their statements by interrogation in the ordinary way, he persistently interrupted with attempts to put words into the witnesses' mouths or to prevent them from saying something of a committing nature. I bore with him for some time with a good deal of long-suffering, but was finally obliged to ask him to sit to one side and behind the witnesses and to reserve his communications and cross-examination of each witness till I had finished with him. This had the desired effect, and I was able to carry on with less interruption.

I examined nine that day and the remaining two the following morning.

Copies of their statements are attached (Inclosure 28), but they are worth very little. One and all came in with the idea above mentioned that they would be allowed to rattle off the statement which they had evidently been tutored in.

In any case they were obviously sent there for a purpose, namely, to give proof that it was the Persians who attacked the Arabs, and that was the chief point that they were anxious to make clear.

The statements of some of them, however, under examination rather corroborated than otherwise the opposite view, and I may point out that in spite of the Sheikh's argument that it was the Arabs who were attacked, not a single Arab was or has been produced who suffered the slightest injury, nor do the Arab witnesses seriously maintain that any did come to real harm.

The bad sight arising from neglected eye disease of the young man Ramzan lends

probability to the story given by him as to the origin of the fracas, and though it is possible that, after the collision with the Seedie, Ramzan rounded on him and struck the first blow, yet the same bad sight from which Ramzan suffers makes that supposition less probable than the other.

There is no doubt, however, that the collision referred to was the origin of the row, and whether the Seedie struck the first blow or the Persian, we know that in the result two Persians, both perfectly harmless individuals, and one a decrepit octogenarian, were very nearly killed, and seven others severely beaten.

To one perusing the statements of the witnesses, it will, I have no doubt, suggest itself in several places that another person mentioned might have been called, or that a particular point wanted judicially clearing up. It must be remembered, however, that after each sitting I interviewed Sheikh Isa and that his attitude gave me little reason to hope that my examination of witnesses at all was likely to be anything more than a farce owing to his impossible attitude.

12. December 8.—After taking two more statements of persons who had got tired of waiting, and had absconded the day before, I proceeded with Captain Prideaux to Muharrag to see the Sheikh.

I was prepared for difficulty in bringing him round, but not for the change of front which we now experienced.

I began by telling him that I had examined all his witnesses, as desired, and asked him what impression his son and Vazier had given him of the nature of their testimony. He replied that they had duly posted him.

I then showed him the file of statements that I had brought, and asked him whether he would like to have them translated to him now, or whether I could leave an interpreter with him to do it at leisure. He said "No;" he did not want them read or translated, he could call for the men himself if he wanted to hear their statements. I replied that in that case all that remained to be done was for me to give him my opinion on the case, and with his permission I proceeded to do so.

13. I explained that the only point on which the evidence of the Arabs seemed to throw any doubt was as to whether, after the collision in the street, it was the Persian or the Arab boy who struck the first blow; that that point did not seem to be of the first importance, and was certainly no excuse for the murderous attack which had been made on a whole family, including an unfortunate old greybeard, who had been innocently wending his way home after his long Ramzan day in his shop.

I continued that, in spite of his allegation and the Mullah's "Istishhad" to the effect that it was the Arabs who had been attacked and had suffered, not a single wounded man was produced or wound proved, nor was there a trace of any.

It was altogether contrary to probability that this one family of merchants and men of peace (Abdu Nabi's), part of an exceedingly small community of Persians, should for a moment dare to get up a concerted attack upon Arabs in an Arab town of some thousands of inhabitants.

I thought there was no getting over the fact that a serious offence had been committed by a number of roughs among his subjects, and that it was incumbent upon him as a Ruler to set aside his religious prejudices and have adequate justice meted out.

14. I then repeated to him the measures which I had proposed to him before (Inclosure 30), and also repeated that I was prepared to meet him half-way in regard to any detail, if he was generally prepared to accept my advice.

His reply to this must be noted:—

"I have only one answer to give, namely, that I will do nothing in this case except after trial by my own Shariat or Urf Court."

I pointed out to him (as I had done once before when he mentioned the Shariat) that this was no case for the Shariat, especially when the Shariat would be the Sunni Mullahs, Sheikh Jassim, and his brother, Sheikh Ahmad, who were themselves more or less mixed up in this affair. I added that, in any case in this instance, as he had been told before, the Persians had complained to their Government, which had officially asked us to see justice done, and that he might take my word for it that in this case, at all events, the British Government would not consider that justice would be done by a reference to the local Mullahs. Moreover, no Mahomedan could be compelled to go to a Shariat Court if he did not wish, and the Persians absolutely refused to take that course. I explained to him that it did not mean, so far as my present information went, taking the Persians out of his jurisdiction altogether.

As to his "Urf" or Civil Court, I might be excused for reminding him that no properly constituted Court of that nature existed in his territory, and that I could not agree that after what had passed any suitable persons could be found to form one upon whose integrity and intention to do justice any confidence could be placed.

The Sheikh, however, was quite obdurate, and would give no other answer. Captain Prideaux will bear me witness that I was most patient and quiet with him, and continued for a long time endeavouring to persuade him not to come to a deadlock with me, but to agree to any sort of compromise which would show Government that, at all events, he did not intend to be insubordinate to them, even though he could not agree with their Representative. I suggested the deposit of even 1,000 rupees at the Agency and the detention of six of the ringleaders pending reference to Government. But he would have none of it, and added what amounted to this: "If Government wish to seize Bahrein, even, their arm is long, and they can do it; but I will under no circumstances consent to the trial of these Persians by any Tribunal but my own Courts."

15. It will thus be seen that he had ceased to argue as to the merits of the case itself, or that only one side had been heard, but had altered his position, and was standing out on the question of his jurisdiction over the Persians, a point which he had discussed with Captain Prideaux in the first instance, but had subsequently dropped.

Having quite failed to alter his demeanour, I told him I much regretted that we had arrived at a deadlock, and could no more than report the fact to Government, and then took leave. We had been with him over two hours.

16. I remained in Bahrein the following day, as it was the Ramazan Eed, and it seemed possible that some recrudescence of rowdiness might occur, but all went off quietly, and I left for Bushire on the 10th December, leaving His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" there.

This completes the narrative of the progress of the case. It now remains for me to offer some comment where it seems called for, and to make recommendations for the future for the consideration of the Government of India.

17. Though the Sheikh finally made the question of jurisdiction the bar to any settlement, I doubt myself whether it was really so in fact, and think the real state of the case was that, having heard from his son and his Vazier that the Arab witnesses had fallen to pieces in a great measure, and gathering, at all events, that they had failed to impress me, and that he would therefore no longer be able to argue with me regarding the merits of the case itself, and being unwilling, or unable, owing to the influence of Sheikh Ali and the Mullahs in Manama, to impose any punishment on the Arabs, he had determined to fall back on the question of jurisdiction.

Upon this question of jurisdiction generally I hardly know what the opinion of the Government of India will be. To the best of my belief (and this view is supported off-hand by members of the Residency Staff), we have interfered to protect Persians before, but time does not admit of my verifying this from my records before the mail leaves. Personally, I unhesitatingly express the view that, as we have a virtual Protectorate over Bahrein, it is politically necessary and advisable that we should protect Persians (Shi'ahs), as well as other foreigners, at all events to the extent of preventing the perpetration of injustice upon them.

In the present case I can hardly doubt, in view of the communications which have passed between this Office, the Tehran Legation, and the Persian Government, that the Government of India will decide that it is necessary to afford protection.

18. I now come to the attitude of the Sheikh.

The personal position, i.e., as between the Sheikh and the Resident, is that, after agreeing to await my arrival for the settlement of the case, and after pressing me to make personal inquiries into it, and after I had been to the trouble of doing as he requested, he absolutely refused to consider the evidence seriously, or to meet my views to any extent whatever, and took refuge, with a stubbornness which was almost insulting, in the question of jurisdiction, which he had previously dropped. This aspect of the question is of minor importance, and I merely place it on record.

19. The fact, however, that he should feel able to act in such a way has, in my opinion, a much more sinister significance, and my ten days' enforced sojourn in Bahrein has brought me to the conclusion that the position there is very unsatisfactory indeed.

In Sheikh Isa we have a Chief who owes his existence, his position, and his maintenance in that position, entirely to us. More than that, in his interests, we took the unusual step of recognizing his son Hamed as his heir, in order to strengthen his hands.

Considering these facts, and considering also the time that he has been in close

relations with a British Representative, both he and his son Hamed seem to me to be altogether unable to appreciate either their obligations to the British Government which has fathered them, or their own obligations to themselves as Rulers.

Sheikh Isa, living as he does over at Muharrag, is so weak, or so disinclined to bear the sometimes inconvenient responsibilities of a Ruler, that his Representative in Manama, known as the Bazaar Master, has become necessarily a powerless individual, overawed by Sheikh Ali and those whom he employs or protects, and cannot keep Manama in order.

His son and heir, Sheikh Hamed, who, I may mention, is by the same mother as his cousin or half-brother,* Sheikh Ali, and seems to be personally an overbearing ignorant young man, has apparently no better appreciation of his present and prospective position than his father, and does not give much promise of being a more satisfactory Chief.

20. Sheikh Isa himself is full of years, and I am not prepared to say that he is personally or actively willing either that Manama should become lawless, or that specific injustice should be perpetrated, but he is surrounded by evil advisers (*e.g.*, Mahomed Abdul Wahab, Vazier Shereideh, and the Manama Mullahs, Jassim and Ahmed), and there can be little doubt that on the whole he is a very unsatisfactory Ruler, and that Bahrein, as it is now, does the British Government no credit as a principality over which it has for long exercised a virtual protectorate. In fact, I fear that the Rev. Mr. Zwemer was not very far outside the mark when he wrote five or six years ago, regarding Bahrein:—

"Oppression, blackmail, and bribery are universal, and, except in commerce and the Slave Trade, English protection has brought about no reforms in the island."

21. The question now to be practically considered is what further action is to be taken in the present case. I can hardly foresee what the decision of the Government of India will be, and can only therefore make suggestions, regarding probable eventualities.

If it is decided that we protect these Persians (and I do not see that we can well do otherwise, for if we failed to do so their only safe course would be to leave the island precipitately), then I fear that there is no amicable way out of the difficulty; we shall have to coerce the Sheikh Isa.

If it is determined to take that course, to what extent is it to be done? I think we should gain little by deposing Sheikh Isa and putting up his son Hamed, for the latter is, I fear, too old to be moulded in any way, and if left to himself will certainly be as unsatisfactory as his father.

Short of proclaiming a full British Protectorate, which might perhaps create alarm at the present time, the only course would be to select one of the sons of Sheikh Isa's deposed uncle, Mahommed-bin-Khalifa, of whom there are many living, and some said to be promising. The deposal of Isa and his sons, and the appointment of a son of Mahommed with a binding Treaty with us, would be a simple matter, but again, such a step may perhaps not suit the policy of Government at this juncture.

Failing that, the only alternative is to make the best of Isa and to coerce him in the present case by obliging him to carry out my terms or the decision of Government in the matter and to pay a fine in addition for his refractory behaviour. We might also threaten to replace him by one of Mahommed-bin-Khalifa's descendants.

22. Captain Prideaux is of opinion, and there is I think something in it, that the Sheikh had perhaps become alarmed at the change of Agents at Bahrein, and had connected it with a determination of the Government of India to take over his Customs, and this has inclined him to stand on the defensive in this recent matter and form common cause with Sheikh Ali, and that for this reason our disinterestedness might be suspected if the taking over of his Customs was allowed to become an item of our punitive treatment of him in the present connection.

I admit that there is force in this. On the other hand, if we are going to coerce the Chief, it would save a good deal of trouble to include the Customs question and have done with it, seeing that it has been troubling us so long. I must leave the question in the hands of the Government of India.

23. I now only have to discuss the means of coercion. The position in this connection is not quite so simple as it was when coercive action was last taken at Bahrein. There

* The mother was first married to Ali's father, Sheikh Ahmed, and bore him Ali. She was then divorced by him and afterwards married Sheikh Isa, and bore Hamed.—P. Z. Cox.

is now a considerable community of Europeans in Manama, viz., twelve or fifteen missionaries and two or three European traders, besides our Political Agent. In connection with the present case, the Sheikh, who has no doubt been instigated all through by the Mullahs Jassim and Ahmed, could if he liked arouse a good deal of fanatical feeling in the matter, and this has to be taken into account.

I do not think it would be advisable to propose any fresh terms or settlement to him without having at hand the means to enforce them on the spot, and at present we have not got them. His Majesty's ship "Redbreast," manned as she now is with a Lascar crew and carrying only seven or eight blue-jackets, would be of no use for any work on shore.

In my opinion if it were intended to coerce the Sheikh or depose him, it would be advisable and necessary to have a second ship of war present, and to send a battalion of native infantry, or at all events four companies to Bahrein to camp for the rest of the winter on the open ground outside the Agency, for the reassurance and safeguarding of the European community and of British subjects in general, until matters had settled down.

24. Although, as I observed before, I cannot foresee what view Government will take of this case, *ab initio*, I have thought it advisable to write fully on all points which seem at all likely to be involved.

I may add that Captain Prideaux' views coincided entirely with mine throughout in regard to the attitude of the Sheikh, and when we parted neither of us had any hope that any solution short of coercion was possible.

Writing to me the day after my departure he mentioned that he had nothing fresh to report:

"Only that the Sheikh has closed all the coffee shops in the centre of the Bazaar, professedly to lessen the chances of disturbance, but actually because they are all run by Persians who have only just* opened after a closure of three weeks. The Arab coffee shops are nearer the outskirts of the town and have been allowed to keep open."

This is only another instance of his hostile attitude towards the Persian community.

25. There is one aspect of the question which I forgot to indicate in its proper place. I venture therefore to do so now. It bears on the question of the protection of this community of Persians.

The matter, as mentioned in the body of the Report, has already been discussed at Tehran. If then we see substantial justice done to the subjects of the Shah, the fact of our having done so will, now and always, greatly strengthen the hands of His Majesty's Legation, in pressing claims of ours and as an instance of our general friendliness to the Shah's Government and subjects.

The converse would also be the case.

26. In an analogous connection with the above, I may mention that I have at this moment received an informal note from my German colleague, Herr von Mutius, regretting that, owing to my being in quarantine, he cannot see me personally in order "to present you my best thanks for your efficient help to the German firm, which, I trust, settles the case."

27. I have omitted also to mention that supposing that the Government of India agree to the deportation of Sheikh Ali (which I look upon as of the first importance), I recommend that the period should be not less than five years, if not for an indefinite period.

28. I beg to state, in conclusion, that this Report has occupied me up to the last minute of the mail steamer's presence, being typed sheet by sheet straight from my pen; I shall consequently not be able to revise or alter anything, if it is to catch the mail, and this seems important. I therefore crave indulgence for any clerical errors or loose English of which I may have been guilty.

Inclosure 21 in No. 78.

Captain Prideaux to Major Cox.

Bahrein, November 17, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to report that on the evening of Monday, the 14th instant, a most serious assault was committed by the servants of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed-al-Khalifah and other Arabs on the family of Haji Abdul Nabi Kazerooni and other

† *i.e.*, on our advice on the 7th December.—P. Z. Cox.

innocent Persians who chanced to fall in their way, with the result that two respectable Persians—the father and brother of Abdul Nabi—have been dangerously wounded and seven other Persians less seriously so.

2. The facts of the case, as reported by my Arab Munshi, after thorough inquiry, are as follows: The disturbance arose through a Persian servant of Haji Abdul Nabi and a negro servant of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed brushing against each other in a narrow lane of the Bazaar unintentionally. The negro Marjook, turned furiously on the Persian Ramzan, and after the exchange of a few sentences knocked him down. Seeing other Persians about, he flew at them, using his stick freely, and in a few moments others of his companions had commenced copying his example. Haji Abdul Nabi, who is the monopolist of the cargo-landing business, the contract for which he holds under the Chief's Wazier Abdur Rahman, came running up to subdue the disturbance, but his influence failed to stand him in good stead, and he found himself compelled to flee back to his house to save his life. By this time a number of Sunnis had joined in the excitement coming out of an adjacent mosque, the Mullah of which was urging them to "kill, kill the moguls," and a number of others, including Sheikh Diaij-bin-Selman-al-Khalifa, whose three intimate relatives were the persons killed by the Begai on the mainland in 1900, also came up from the house of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed, who is said to have hurried them forward though he kept out of sight himself.

3. Haji Abdul Nabi, pursued by an infuriated mob, was able to find safety in the midst of women, but his old father, aged 80 years, and his brother were caught, dragged out of the house, and most brutally assaulted. The other Persians injured were mere onlookers, and it is a noticeable fact that no Arabs were at all seriously hurt, though at the present moment an "Istishhad" is being circulated for signature amongst Arabs to the effect that the Persians were the aggressors and that a number of Arabs too have been hurt.

4. On receiving news of the affair, which did not last long in an active state owing to the flight of all the Persians from the streets, I immediately requested Dr. Thoms of the Arabian Mission, my medical attendant, to look at the injured men, and a copy of his Report is attached for your information. I also sent word to Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed that I wished to see him, and he came round to the Agency at about 9 P.M., after eating his food. I found him, in outward appearance, considerably upset at the "contretemps" and certainly somewhat nervous as to the consequences. I told him that I was astonished at the want of control under which his servants apparently existed, not only because the Resident's decision regarding the previous case in which they had been concerned, when M. Bahnson, the German, was hurt, had not been announced, but also because two or three days ago I had sent him as well as other Sheikhs, who reside in the Manama Bazaar, a private message through Haji Abbas to the effect that the Chief had written to me that he did not approve of the "Sukhra" (corvée) system, and that, therefore, if cases of flagrant tyranny in connection with it occurred in the future, the perpetrators were unlikely to get support from Sheikh Isa.

5. Sheikh Ali commenced by denying that he received my message and also that the ringleaders, whom I named, were his servants. He said that the whole power to punish even his own (Sheikh Ali's) followers was wielded by the Chief Sheikh Isa, and he further alleged that if Sheikh Isa would have permitted it, he would have been glad to have tried to settle the case with the Germans amicably out of Court. At the end of our interview he promised to send five of the ringleaders over to Muharrag, where Sheikh Isa, resides, early on the following morning.

6. During the night Sheikh Isa sent one of his head servants to Haji Abdul Nabi's house and told him to rest assured that satisfaction would be given him.

7. In the morning, unaware of the last incident, I called on the Chief and sent word also to such of the sufferers as could move, to be present at the same time. I believe that Sheikh Ali must also have been to the Chief before my arrival, for I found Sheikh Isa's attitude at first most obstinate. He declared that he would not admit any interference from me in cases between Arabs and Persians who were all Mahommedans, and said that he had made up his mind to have the present case settled by a Shara Court. I urged him to the best of my ability to hold the inquiry to himself as no Sunni Shara Court was in the least likely to do justice to Persians, and, moreover, the conduct of more than one of the Al Khalifa family was seriously in question. I then observed that if the Chief ignored my advice in this matter he would be afterwards sorry for it, just as I was sure he would regret not having allowed Sheikh Ali to compound the case which the Germans were pressing against him. The Chief replied that he had heard nothing of any advice given by me to Sheikh Ali, and when I told

him that I had said that I thought that if Sheikh Ali wrote M. Wonckhaus an apology of his own initiative and offered a fair sum of money as compensation to M. Bahnson, the Germans would not be backward in burying the hatchet; the Chief showed considerable signs of interest, and inquired what sum, in my opinion, would be acceptable to the German firm. This question I did not see my way to answer. The Chief at the close of our interview, in which other matters were also discussed, reiterated his declaration that justice would be done to the Persians, and I contented myself with saying that I should follow the course of the inquiry with interest. I must not omit to mention that at the beginning of our interview the Chief declared he would not admit the wounded Persians into his presence, but before I left he did see them.

8. On my return to my house I heard that the two chief ringleaders had again just been assaulting Persians in the Bazaar, that all the Persians in consequence were keeping their shops closed, and that Sheikh Ali's men were patrolling the streets in bands of ten and fifteen on the lookout for casual Persians. I, therefore, sent Haji Abbas back again at once to the Chief with this news and a message that if any further harm was done, he himself could not possibly be absolved from blame. I repeated a suggestion that I had made that Sheikh Ali should be ordered to reside in Muharrag, during the month of Ramzan, and that the Chief should send over some of his own immediate followers from Muharrag to police the Manama Bazaar streets. The Chief sent me back word that he would see that no further trouble occurred, and also that he had after all decided to hold the inquiry himself. He did not, however, follow the advice I had given him as mentioned above.

9. Yesterday, Wednesday, the Persian shops remained closed and Sheikh Ali's men continued behaving as before. To-day the news has been brought to me that Sheikh Isa has sent a message to Haji Abdul Nabi that as he appealed to me for help he need expect no consideration from himself. The Persian sufferers have all been told that they must attend the Shara Court, and the Persian community in general are to be fined 5,000 rupees for keeping their shops closed.

10. In these circumstances I have not considered it desirable to postpone my Report to you until the advent of the next up mail steamer, which is due in three or four days, but I am sending this letter by a buggalow, specially provided by the Persian community.

11. The man responsible for this outbreak, I am convinced, is Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed. You are aware that his father until his death unofficially shared with Sheikh Isa in the Government of the islands. He lived in the large house on the sea-shore in Manama City, which is still recognized as "Government House" and occupies the whole of one side of the open square in which the saluting gun lies, and close to the Customs office and general landing stage. This house is now the property of Sheikh Ali, who took great offence at Sheikh Isa's appointing his son Sheikh Hamad to succeed to his father's position instead of himself. To console himself for the slight which he considered put upon him, Sheikh Ali has formed around his person a bodyguard of big men, mostly negroes, who are a terror to all quietly-disposed residents in the Bazaar, and whom I believe no man in the Chief's entourage dares touch. Nearly all the men who are implicated in the Bahnson affair have now also taken part in this more recent case. It may be that Sheikh Isa is unwilling to see the family dignity injured through the punishment even of a nephew who is disloyal to himself, but I firmly believe now that my predecessor, Mr. Gaskin's, view is also correct, that the Chief dare not attempt to exercise authority over Sheikh Ali. The fact that Sheikh Ali is disloyal, at any rate in thought, to his uncle is proved by his saying to me, when he called at the Agency to welcome my arrival, that if he had the share in the Government which his father had held, he would be happy to use his influence towards the proper reformation of the Customs administration.

12. I now have to make the following recommendations. In the absence of a British gunboat it is certain that no punitive measures will be submitted to by Sheikh Ali and his gang, either in the Wonckhaus case or the present one. I hope that as quickly as possible a gunboat may be sent here, and, if possible, allowed to remain here during the month of Ramzan, as I am not too confident that even the Hindu community will be safe much longer.

13. I think that on the arrival of the man-of-war Sheikh Ali should be summoned on board with all his male servants. M. Bahnson might be invited on board and asked to identify the men who were concerned in the assault on himself. All such who may be known to have taken part also in the later affair should be soundly flogged on board, then sent to Muharrag for one year's imprisonment, and then expelled from the

islands in the event of security for good behaviour not being forthcoming. I think such action on our part as this is justified by the Chief's weakness and actively wrongful attitude.

14. Sheikh Ali should be banished from Bahrein, and preferably made to reside at Aden, for at least ten years. His brothers can administer his properties and remit him the proceeds. The old "Government House" should, however, be made over at a valuation to the Chief for the use of his son Sheikh Hamad.

15. Finally, Sheikh Isa, I think, should be told emphatically that no disputes between Shiah and Sunnis are henceforth to be referred to the Shara Court, any more than disputes between Hindus and Mahomedans are. The Shiahs, who are mostly Persians, in the absence of the Shah's Consular representatives, naturally look to us for protection, and, as the British Government are interested in the welfare of all classes in Bahrein, they cannot view with equanimity the injustice even of making Bahrein Shiahs (who are all Persian by origin) submit to the jurisdiction of a religious Court other than their own. All such cases should be adjudicated upon by the Chief himself or by an impartial Mejlis.

Inclosure 22 in No. 78.

Dr. Thoms to Captain Prideaux.

Bahrein, November 15, 1904.

I SAW nine of the wounded Persians you asked me to see, and found two of them in a critical condition from their wounds. Some of the others were badly bruised and cut, but not sufficiently to endanger life.

Mahomed-bin-Rathi has four very bad scalp wounds, and his back is one mass of bruises. He had been having fever for some days before he was wounded, which makes his condition much more critical.

Haji Kelanazi has six scalp wounds, a compound fracture of one of the bones of the hand, and various bruises on his body, mainly on his back. He is in a semi-comatose condition, and, on account of his age, which is probably above eighty, his condition is quite critical.

Inclosure 23 in No. 78.

Captain Trevor to Mr. Grant Duff.

November 23, 1904.

(Telegraphic.)

NEWS received that serious affray took place at Bahrein between Arabs and Persians, in which former were aggressors. Several Persians were wounded. Our Political Agent is demanding punishment of offenders and compensation, and I am sending gunboat to support his demands. I hear that the Persians have complained to their Government by telegraph, and so let you have this information.

Inclosure 24 in No. 78.

Mr. Grant Duff to Captain Trevor.

Tehran, November 24, 1904.

(Telegraphic.)

REFERENCE your telegram No. 108.

Your action is approved, and the Mushir-ed-Dowleh has been informed of steps taken.

Inclosure 25 in No. 78.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Persian Traders in Bahrein.

(Translation.)
(Telegraphic.)

[Undated.]

I RECEIVED your telegram regarding the assault on you by the Bahrein Arabs. Keep yourselves calm, for I have had a long talk with the British Minister on the subject, and I am sure he will take early steps to get the affair settled and get the culprits punished.

Inclosure 26 in No. 78.

Captain Prideaux to Major Cox.

Bahrein, November 19, 1904.

IN continuation of my letter dated the 17th instant, I have the honour to report that the Persian shops are still closed in the Manama Bazaar, and the Persians, who have been summoned to the Shara Court, have refused to appear there. They state that it was Sheikh Jassim himself, the leading Mullah in the islands, who sent the worshippers out of his mosque to join in the affray, and that if they appear before him, as they have been ordered to, it is a foregone conclusion that they will be found guilty of having commenced the disturbance, and will be sentenced to punishments of flogging or imprisonment.

2. I believe it is a fact that Sheikh Jassim is a friend of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed, and that he is not very loyal to the Chief of Bahrein. The latter only sends cases to him for settlement when he is anxious to wash his own hands of all connection with them.

3. Sheikh Isa is aware of the dispatch of my last letter to you by buggalow, and he has now concurred in my suggestion that the settlement should stand over until the receipt of your orders. At the same time Sheikh Ali's followers are still parading the streets in force, and I do not consider the situation will revert to normal until the arrival of a man-of-war here. I omitted in my last letter to say that Sheikh Ali did not fulfil his promise to me about sending the five ringleaders over to Muharrag, and he has recently sent me word that he broke this promise because Sheikh Jassim, the Mullah, had ordered him not to carry out my request. This excuse I do not accept as satisfactory.

4. With regard to the suggestions for punishment that I made in my last letter, I wish to observe that I do not believe there will be any difficulty about getting Sheikh Isa to acquiesce in them. There are more than one precedent in the records of your Office to show that orders for the banishment of individuals, or the infliction of fines have been submitted to without protest or delay. Moreover, the Chief is so weak and afraid of a portion of his subjects that he is glad to be able to tell them that his actions are prompted by *force majeure*. I am aware that, in regard to the customs question, the Government of India do not wish to gain their ends directly by compulsion, but in the present cases, if our authority is not unhesitatingly vindicated, our prestige will be lowered, not only here, but probably in the entire length of the Arab Coast. In these circumstances, I earnestly hope that you will be able to see your way to authorizing the adoption of strong measures as quickly as possible.

Inclosure 27 in No. 78.

Statements of Persian Subjects.

Depositions.

(1.)

KAL (i.e., KARBELAI) AHWAZ states, on solemn affirmation:—

I was in my shop in the afternoon in question, and, having heard from my son Abdu Nabi that my servants were being beaten, I closed my shop and went towards my house,

but was overtaken and assaulted. I was knocked down in the street by a crowd of Arabs. They hit me on the head, body, and arms, and I fell insensible, and when I came to I found myself in my house.

Note.—This witness, a very old man, aged about 80, was brought in on a litter. He was in a very critical state, and not in a fit condition to be cross-examined or give further evidence. I therefore sent him away, fearing that the ordeal might kill him.

(2.)

Haji Abdul Nabi-bin-Kal Ahwaz, son of last witness (No. 1) on solemn affirmation:—

I am a business man. My chief work is as hamal bashi for the Sheikh of Bahrein. I am also in the employment of Gray, Paul, and Co., in connection with the lighter service. I am also dubash for the British navy in Bahrein.

My age is about 35.

I was in the Customs warehouse (Amara) in the afternoon about 10 o'clock Arabic (= 4 P.M. English).

Two of my nephews, Ali and Rahkhuda, came and told me that my employé and weighing man, Ramzan, had been killed in the bazaar by being beaten to death by Arabs.

I thereupon ran to the bazaar, and found a crowd of people mobbing Ramzan, who was under their feet. I called out, and asked them why they were beating my servant. They then caught me by the collar, and said, "Let us take him to Ali-bin-Ahmed (the Sheikh's nephew). They then dragged me a few yards out of the bazaar, when we met Mansoor-bin-Khairullah, acting Bazaar Master, who rescued me from their hands.

I then went unmolested to my father's shop, and found it closed, and my father just on the way to his house. I joined him. On the way we met Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed's negro, Bakheit-el-Nubi, who pretended to pacify me, and to make little of what had happened, and joined us himself. Close to my house is a mosque called Musjid-i-Juma. As we approached it I noticed a large gathering of Arabs armed with sticks, daggers, and swords, standing in the road. Bakheit held up his hands in a deprecatory way, ostensibly as if to say to them, "Let them alone," and called out, "Balakum, balakum," i.e., "Take care, take care."

I think, however, that it must really have been a prearranged sign, because they immediately made an assault upon us. They hit me on my hands and arms, upraised for self-protection, as I tried to escape. They caught hold of my cloak, which came away from my shoulders, and I escaped to the house of Ali-bin-Kasim-Bushiri.

There was no male in the house, and I went to the women's quarter. Two men from the mob followed me with drawn swords. I do not know their names, but I can recognize them. They beat me with the flat of their swords, and said, "Let us take him to Ali-bin-Ahmed." I said, "All right; I will go." I came as far as the threshold. Then I thought to myself that they might kill me, and ran back into the house among the women. The same two men followed me, and were trying to drag me out when the women began to scream, and a man entered (Mahomed-bin-Surhan (Arab), their next-door neighbour, a servant of Ali-bin-Ahmed) and took the two assailants out and left me in the house, and the door was closed. One of the two assailants was an Abyssinian slave of Ali-bin-Ahmed, and the other is his servant (i.e., Ali's servant).

I remained there till three hours after sunset, when Dr. Thoms and Mr. Lobo, at the Consul's request, came to see after me. They informed me that my father and brother had been very severely wounded.

The only reason I can think for this occurrence and the assault upon my employé is that it is I, as hamal bashi, who have had to detect and demand the punishment of persons who rob from the lighters and the custom-house. They have not threatened me openly, but their object is to do me harm with the Sheikh and get me out.

I have little or nothing to do with Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed personally. After the affray, during the night, Sheikh Isa's negro came to me from his master. He asked me to overlook what had happened, and assured me from the Sheikh that the culprits would be adequately punished. I showed the messenger the critical state of my father and brother, and he was very much shocked, and went away to report.

In the morning I went with Captain Prideaux to the Sheikh to Muharrag. I

took the wounded men in a separate boat. I saw the Sheikh in Captain Prideaux's presence. The Sheikh suggested that we should go to the Shariat.

I demurred against going to the Shariat on the grounds that his nephew, Ali-bin-Ahmed, in conjunction with the Mullahs Sheikh Jassim and Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Mahzar had ordered the assassination of the Persians and put up the assault on us, and these same Mullahs are the "Shariat."

My reason for saying this was that Mullah Sheikh Ahmed and Sheikh Beraini, his brother, were standing among the mob outside the mosque looking on, and even the women came out with sticks or pestles, and Sheikh Ali's servants were mixed up in it as well. I never agreed to go to the Shariat for a moment. Ben Jilal, the Sheikh's servant, did come to me the third day after the occurrence, and wanted to take me to Sheikh Jassim, but I refused, and informed Captain Prideaux that I had done so.

There is no Mullah here whose decision or arbitration we as Shias could possibly accept in this vital case.

Evidence taken in the presence of the Sheikh's Vazier, Shereideh, who has no further questions to put.

[Witness recalled, 6th December, 1904.]

It is quite true I have a revolver. I got it about three months ago from a man in Muharrag. The reason was this. I ran down some robbers three months ago—Arabs from Bussorah—who had been committing several robberies, eight were imprisoned, three are still (in prison?), and five were released and expelled. Being in fear of my life on this account, I bought a revolver in Muharrag, and got a countryman of mine, named Ali Mahomed, always to walk about with me, and to sleep in my house. Ali is a poor man, working hard for his living, and lodging next door, so I selected him in order to give him a job. My sight is too bad for me to use a revolver myself, and, moreover, I know nothing about fire-arms or the use of them. I cannot recognize anybody at more than 3 or 4 yards, and in the daytime I always wear glasses. My eyes were operated on in Bushire a short time ago, but I have derived no benefit from it.

(3.)

Mahomed Reza-bin-Kal Ahwaz states, on solemn affirmation:—

I am a brother of Haji Abdu Nabi, and son of Kal Ahwaz. I am a grocer by profession. Some time ago, about 11 o'clock Arabic (an hour before sunset) I went from my shop to my house to say my prayers, and while returning I was informed that there was a fight going (on?) between Arabs and Persians, in which Abdu Nabi was included. I reached my shop safely and closed it (or told my boys to close it), and then turned to go home again. On the way I saw my father and brother passing, together with my younger brother Mahmud. They were on their way home. I did not speak to them or join them, as I wanted to go and buy some fruit. After doing so I went in the direction of my house. When I arrived near the Musjid-i-Juma I saw numbers of people running here and there. On getting nearer the Musjid people set upon me from both sides. There was a great number of people. They were Arabs, including Sidis. They beat me with sticks and large pestles on the shoulders and head without any words or any warning. I was felled to the ground and became insensible. Some one carried me to my house, and I came to consciousness afterwards, when the doctor was dressing my head. I still feel giddy when I sit up, and have been incapacitated from work ever since. My right hand is cut and now bound up. I do not know how the wound was inflicted.

I know no reason for all this. The attack was so sudden that I could not swear to any of my assailants.

No cross-examination.

Note.—This witness' skull turned out to be fractured, but he is progressing favourably.

(4.)

Ramzan-bin-Ghulam, Persian, duly affirmed, states :—

My age is about 20. I am employed by Abdu Nabi.

On the afternoon in question I was in the Amarah and then went to the bazaar to buy fish. Before I had reached the fish shop, I had to pass through a very narrow part of the bazaar. My sight is very bad (note one eye is evidently quite blind and the left half blind), and I ran up against a man by mistake who was standing in the street. He abused me, and when I asked him why he did so, he assaulted me severely with his fists. I could not recognize him then, and do not now know who he is. The time was evening, when many people are always collected, especially in Ramzan (about two hours before sunset). The Arabs present assisted him of their own accord and joined in the assault upon me. They knocked me down time after time, I trying to escape. At last I took refuge in a ruined house and hid myself, and they lost me and left me. A Persian named Haji Hassan says he saw the occurrence.

No cross-examination.

(5.)

Haji Hassan-bin-Mahomed Ali states on solemn affirmation :—

A few days ago in the evening I was in the bazaar buying sweetmeats. I saw Ramzan, a Persian, who was passing, run into some one. The street is narrow and he ran by mistake into the man, who was an Arab. I did not know who the Arab was, but I can recognize him. He was a youth, beardless and wheat colour. The Arab turned round and caught hold of Ramzan and abused him. Ramzan said that he did not mean to do it, and that the street was narrow. He (Ramzan) said, "Is there no justice in the town, that you hustle me without reason?" Then other people came up and beat Ramzan. I made myself scarce for fear of being beaten too and saw no more. I closed my shop and went to my house.

No cross-examination.

(6.)

Adulla-bin-Haji Ali Reza, aged 20, states on solemn affirmation :—

I am a servant of Kal Ahwaz.

On the evening of the day in question, about half an-hour before sunset, I was taking bread from the bazaar to the house of my master, Kal Ahwaz, when I was attacked by about twelve persons with loaded sticks and walking sticks, and wounded on the head, face, arms, &c., I fell down under the blows.

While I was down and they beating me, a Bahreini came and separated them, and I got up and made my escape. I don't know the man's name, who helped me, nor should I recognize him, as I was hit between the eyes and they were full of blood. I can't identify any of the Arabs and Sidis who struck me, except one.

The first blow was from a negro named Marzuk. He is a loafer. I don't know whom he belongs to. I can't recognize any of the others. The first blows were on my head and knocked me silly. The Mission doctor attended me. I am still sick. I could work now, but the shop is closed. I did not see any one else attacked.

No cross-examination.

(7.)

Abdul Rahim-bin-Hassan Kazerani, aged about 23, on solemn affirmation :—

I was weighing sugar in my shop (that of Kal Ahaz, whose servant I am). I left the sugar and went into the street to buy fish. I saw a crowd, and went to see what was up. I found Ramzan with a group of men round him, who were beating him. There were a great lot of them, Arabs and Sidis. When I went up, they hit me on the head

and arms. I received about six blows; after that I became insensible. I remember four persons striking me. The names of the two are :—

1. Marzuk-bin-Zaid, a loafer Sidi boy.
2. Saad-bin (?) an Arab, also a loafer.

I could recognize the other two, one is Marzuk's brother, the other a relation of Marzuk. I believe I was carried on a donkey to my house by one Sadiq, but have no recollection. I was insensible for two days, and was attended by the Mission doctor. I am not able to work yet, and my hand and body still give me much pain. I was beaten to insensibility before Sadiq and Abbas were beaten, and do not know who beat them.

(8.)

Sadiq-bin-Ghulam Hussein, about 20 years of age, states on solemn affirmation :—

I am servant to Haji Ahwaz and work in his shop. I was about to close the shop for the day (one of Haji Ahwaz' five shops), when I heard that Ramazan was being killed. I ran for the spot, but when I got as far as Abdu Reza Dowani's shop, I was assaulted by three persons from a crowd. They hit me over the head with sticks, and I fled towards Kal Ahwaz' house; but before going there I lay low on the sea-shore till all was quite.

The men who struck me were negroes. I can recognize them, but do not know their names. I don't know but people tell me they are Ali-bin-Ahmed's servants. I only know them by sight. I have been two years here.

I know Abdul Rahman-bin-Hassan. He is my fellow servant. I did not see him beaten, nor did I see anything of him at all at that time. They brought him home in the night. My head was bad and bleeding, and I knew nothing about it at the time.

No cross-examination.

(9.)

Abbas-bin-Kal Reza Najyar states on solemn affirmation :—

I am a carpenter, and work with my father, who has been employed at work on British Agency building. My age is about 25.

One day some time ago my father sent me to the bazaar about 4 P.M. to buy food. We were working at the Residency at the time. I went first to my house to get a saucer for ghee, and then went to the bazaar. At the entrance to the bazaar I was suddenly attacked. There was a crowd of over 100 Arabs and Sidis. There were even women there who joined in. I received a shower of blows from the mob. I recognized two of my assailants :—

1. Is, well known as Bukheit-el-Nubi.
2. Marzuk, a negro.

Both belong to Ali-bin-Ahmed. When they prepared to strike me, I said "What's up?" They replied, "Ask your father." A common insulting form of reply.

They knocked me down, and I became insensible. When I recovered my senses I was in my own house, and found that my coat had been cut open and my watch stolen, also 8 rupees just received from Mr. Zwemer as pay. I presume the Arabs took me home.

I do know Abdul Rahim-bin-Hassan, if he is the same as "Rahimu," but did not see him on this afternoon. I only heard from the Mission doctor that he also was one of the wounded.

I know Sadiq-bin-Ghulam Hussein, but did not see him that afternoon. I can give no reason for the assault upon me except that I am a Persian. I have never been maltreated before during seven years' residence here.

No cross-examination.

120

(10.)

Mahomed-bin-Kal Salmun Bushiri, 25 years, on solemn affirmation states:—

I am a baker. I have a shop of my own near the bazaar. Between 9 and 10 (Arabic) on the day in question I heard a noise going on in the bazaar, and went to see what it was. I had hardly reached the spot (at entrance to the bazaar) I got a blow from a mashab (knob-kerry with a lump of pitch at the end used for fighting) in the face on the left cheek bone. I still suffer much pain, and cannot masticate. There were many people present, but I was only beaten by one, an Arab.

I do not know his name, and could not recognize him if I saw him.

I fell down when I was hit.

I had 8 rupees in my pocket, which were spilt. I picked myself up and ran for my life.

I came from Bushire less than a month ago, and do not know Arabic, and did not understand what the mob said. I was so frightened that I did not close my shop. A friend kindly did so for me, namely, my partner, Kal Kazim. I took refuge in my house.

I did not see any one else being beaten.

Inclosure 28 in No. 78.

Statements of Arabs sent to Resident by the Sheikh of Bahrein.

(12.)

HASSAN-BIN-AHMED IBRAHIM, aged about 40, on solemn affirmation:—

I remember the occasion on which the disturbance occurred; it was 5th Ramzan. On that afternoon I went to the bazaar to buy necessities (which the Persians deal in). I made my purchases and was going back to my house, when I saw a disturbance going on near Abdul Reza Dowani's shop. Persians and Arabs were mixed up and quarrelling. I passed by them and did not enter among them; no one touched me. I did not speak to any of them. I did not try to stop them, as I thought they would beat me, and I got away as quietly as I could.

I saw Abdu Nabi coming towards the crowd from the opposite direction. I had got up on to a shop counter in order to see what was going on, and saw over the heads of the quarrelling people that Abdu Nabi, preceded by a servant, was coming from the opposite direction. Abdu Nabi's servant had a revolver in his hand. I don't know his name. I could identify him if I saw him. He did not fire the revolver. I then went to my house. I had no curiosity to see any more, and wished to get away, and ran as quickly as I could. I know no more.

There were 100 or 200 men, I should say. I did not count them.

I cannot say how many Arabs or how many Persians there were. (After being prompted by Sheikh Hamad, he says the Persians were in the majority.)

I was sent for by Mullah Sheikh Ahmed with the others last Friday.

No further cross-examination.

(13.)

Saleh-el-Mirian, negroid, aged 40, states on solemn affirmation:—

I am a diver's assistant (gheis). I live in Bahrein. I remember the disturbance early in the month. I said afternoon prayers in my own house. Afterwards I went to Buzuzi's shop to buy coffee. Before I arrived there, I saw near the shop of Muallim that a servant of Abdu Nabi, a one-eyed man, was caught by one Saad Gahtani, and was trying to get loose, in order to go for the Arabs, of whom there were two boys, who wanted to quarrel with him. Abdu Nabi's servant got loose and reached the boys, and they began fighting. A large number of Arabs—I can't say how many—were collected there. Meanwhile Abdu Nabi arrived with some of his servants and some of the shop

121

people. Abdu Nabi called out "Bizan," "el Ghowazi fil bet," "strike." "I have the money in my house" (i.e., money for paying compensation if necessary).

They struck a negro named Marzuk-bin-Ismail and made his face bleed; and he caught hold of Abdu Nabi by the chest of his coat. I then went away to my house and saw no more. I did not meet any wounded person in the street, nor did I see any one wounded except Marzuk.

I was sent for last Friday to Sheikh Ahmed's (December 2nd), and they wrote down my statement.

No cross-examination.

(14.)

Ahmed Nasir-Bahreini, aged 40, on solemn affirmation, states:—

I am a rice seller. I remember the disturbance at the beginning of this month, the 4th or 5th. On that day I was in my shop selling groceries. My shop is outside the bazaar. The disturbance was far from my shop. I could not see it from my shop. A number of Persians passed my shop going towards the bazaar. I don't know who any of them were. They were like masons. They went silently together. No one that I recognized was with them. Afterwards they came back about ten minutes later, and Arabs were with them. The Arabs were frightened and running away, and Persians following them. There were not more than fifty persons, or slightly under. When I saw them, i.e., the Persians, they were beating the Arabs. I saw no Arab killed, or any wounded. I did not see any Persian killed, but I saw Abdu Nabi's father and brother lying on the ground and the Arabs beating them.

After I saw the Persian masons coming back, as above stated, I closed my shop. I closed early owing to the disturbance, as I thought there was no more chance of business.

When I shut up, I went towards my house. I saw people beating Mahomed Kal Reza and his father. I did not help them; I am too poor a person. I made off to my house. Arabs were actually beating them. I cannot recognize any of them. There was a crowd of about 80 or 100 persons—slaves, Arabs, home-born negroes, and some women.

There were only two Persians—Mahomed and his father. Abdu Nabi was running away. Some Arabs were following him to beat him.

They reached him, but he escaped by his good luck. He escaped to Ali-bin-Kazim's house. I saw him go in there with people after him, but I did not see other people enter the house. The people inside closed the door. I then went home and did not come out again. I don't know what was the beginning of the row. I stated something in an ishtishhad (testimony paper) about this. I gave it in the house of Mullah Sheikh Ahmed, brother of Mullah Sheikh Jassim. Mansur-bin-Khair Allah took me there. The Mullah asked me to say what I had seen. I told him I had seen the Persians running after the Arabs. Salman Megu wrote it. He is a shopkeeper. I did not tell them all I have told you. They did not ask me so much; they only took down a few words from me and then allowed me to go.

Cross-examined by Sheikh Hamed:—

Some of the Persian masons had canes and some thick sticks—I don't know what for.

I don't know how many Arabs and how many Persians there were, but there were about fifty altogether. The Arabs were carrying nothing in their hands. I saw a revolver in the hands of one of the servants of Abdu Nabi. He did not fire it, and I don't know what he wanted it for.

When the masons passed back from bazaar, I saw Kahtani's son go among them and they beat him. I did not see any other Arabs beaten except Walad Kahtam. He fell down and got up and bolted and hid himself in the shop of Mubarak-el-Gameis. After that they left him alone and the Persians dispersed.

[1516]

2 I

(14a.)

Abdulla-bin-Saad, Arab, aged 40, on solemn affirmation, states:—

I keep a piece-goods shop in the "Sook-el-Maghasis." I remember the disturbance at the beginning of this month. I said my "asr" prayers that day at the mosque of Mahomed-bin-Ahmed. After that I returned to my shop and stayed there until the disturbance began. The first that I saw was that Abdu Nabi passed my shop with many Persians. I only know one who had a revolver. I can't say why I noticed him, only I closed my shop and went away. Nobody told me the word "Rearwar," although I usually know the weapon as "fard." Abdu Nabi had a stick in his hand and so had the others. They passed me and I saw no more.

I was subsequently sent for by Sheikh Ahmed with the other people. I don't know what day, but about ten days ago.

They asked me what I knew and I said I saw Abdu Nabi in the bazaar in front of his servants saying to them "Buzan, Buzan, el Faloos fel bet." He said these exact words.

(The others have quoted him differently, and it is to be noted that "Bezan" is Persian and the rest Arabic.)

(15.)

Abdul Aziz-bin-Salim, negroid, aged about 40, states on solemn affirmation:—

I am a diver in the service of Abdulla-bin-Hassan Doseri. I live in Bahrein in a house of my own. I have been here the whole of Ramzan. A disturbance occurred about the 5th. I was here at the time. In the afternoon I said my "asr" prayers in the mosque called "Juman," and afterwards went to the Persian bazaar and sat outside a Halwa shop. I had no business there particularly. I sat talking to a friend, Ahmed-bin-Haji Abdulla. I sat there about three hours or three and a-half hours. The name of the owner of the shop was Haji Abdulla and Ahmed, his son above-mentioned. No one else was sitting there. While there I saw Abdu Nabi's weighing boy standing near the Halwa shop. He was doing nothing particular. Another boy, an Arab, passed him and ran against him. The servant of Abdu Nabi caught hold of the Arab boy by the neck. The Arab boy had his brother with him and they both closed with the Persian. This was quite close to me. I went up and interfered and stopped them. They none of them had sticks, but small canes, which they used, but did not hurt one another. After I separated them, they went away. After fifteen minutes later Abdu Nabi came himself from the Amara. He abused the two Arabs who had quarrelled with his servant. I do not know the Arabs' names. I should recognize them if I saw them. The Arabs did not return the abuse. Abdu Nabi then went to the Amara, at least I suppose so, as he brought back workmen with him. He was away about a quarter of an hour. When he came back, he was with his workmen walking in front of them. He had nothing in his hands, but ordered his men to "Bezan," strike. He meant to strike four or five Arabs who were sitting there, including the two boys who had quarrelled with his servant. They did not kill any Arab in my presence, nor did I see any wounded or hurt. They then left the bazaar. I returned to my house. I saw no more disturbance, nor did I see any one wounded, but I heard there was a row in the street, but was not curious enough to go and see it.

I was subsequently called by Mansoor-bin-Kheir Allah (last Friday, the 2nd December) to Sheikh Ahmed's house afternoon prayers. Vazier Shereideh was present, and others whom they had collected for testimony. Mullah Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Mahzar took my statement. Salman Megu wrote it. They asked me what had happened. I told them as above. They wrote it down. I gave my verbal evidence to Sheikh Ahmed once before, but he did not write it down. He sent for me. He practically governs in Manana. In any matter of occurrence in the bazaar Sheikh Jassim and Sheikh Ahmed (the two Mullahs) settle them.

I haven't the least idea who the two Arab boys were.

Cross-examined by Sheikh Ahmed:—

There was no revolver in Abdu Nabi's hand.

His people struck the Arabs when he said "Bezan, Bezan," and the Arabs then left the bazaar.

I cannot say how many Persians there were.

(16.)

Musa-bin-Yusuf, Arab, of Hassa, aged 50, states on solemn affirmation:—

I am a broker, selling clothes. I have a shop. I remember the disturbance at the beginning of Ramzan. I was in my shop that afternoon, and, having closed my shop, was about to go to my house. While going there, I found Abdu Nabi with some Persians near the Persian shops. I saw about nine men. Abdu Nabi had nothing in his hand. His servant, Aliyan, had a revolver in his hand, and others had sticks. I can see well (his eyes look as if he could not see, being very opaque). Ali was holding up the revolver. He did not fire it. He and the men with him were running. Abdu Nabi was ahead and calling out "Bezan, Bezan," referring to the Arabs, about eight or nine who were there. I saw the Persian strike a negro domestic named Saad-bin-Ferhan-bu-Khairallah.

Abdu Nabi called out, "Kill him; his blood money is in my box." I passed on and went home. They hit him with sticks, but did not hurt him severely, three or four blows.

I saw no more until I got home. I was only called to Sheikh Ahmed's house last Friday (2nd December). I gave the same statement as I have given now.

(17.)

Hassan Mohammed, Arab, aged 30, states on solemn affirmation:—

I am a grocer. I remember the disturbance at the beginning of Ramzan.

I was sitting in my shop in the evening. Ali, the servant of Abdu Nabi, passed my shop. He was accompanied by five or six Bushiris, labourers; he was at their head and had a revolver in his hands, the others had sticks. They were hurrying along. Ali did not fire his revolver before me. In front of my shop they struck a boy named Queran-bin-Saad, an Arab. I don't know why they struck him.

They gave him one or two blows and he bolted. After I saw this I closed my shop and went to my house, fearing some disturbance.

I was sent for to Sheikh Ahmed's house last Friday (2nd December).

Sheikh Ahmed and Shereideh were present, and took down something of what I said.

No cross-examination.

(18.)

Ahmed-bin-Kazim, Bahreini, aged 35, rice dealer, states on solemn affirmation:—

I remember the day of the disturbance, about five or six days from beginning of Ramzan. I was in my shop towards sunset selling rice. I heard people who were coming from the bazaar towards my shop speaking of a row. They said, "There was a disturbance at the house of Kol Awaz; people were beating the boy of Kal Awaz." I did not move from my shop. I heard no more and saw no more. As I was sitting there, I saw the masons of Abdu Nabi going into the bazaar. I did not know where they were going. They were going fast, and Abdu Nabi's servant—I don't know his name—was in front of them. Abdu Nabi was not there. I do not know where he was. I subsequently closed my shop, fearing it might be robbed, and went towards the Masjid Juma, and on the way I heard that Abdu Nabi and his father and his brother and another (four in all) had been killed by (zagit ruffians). I went on in that direction, thinking I might be able to help Mahomed Reza (Abdu Nabi's brother), perhaps by carrying him home or in any other way.

There was no one at the Musjid. The row had stopped and the wounded men had been removed to their houses. I then went home. I did not see any one wounded then, but next day I saw Abdu Rahim Kal Awaz' servant and he was wounded, and also another man related to Hussein, whose name I did not know. I did not see the beginning of the row. I know no more. I did not see what was in the hands of Abu Nabi's masons. I went to Sheikh Ahmed's last Friday with the others.

No further cross-examination.

(19.)

Hussein Mahomed, Arab, aged 25, states on solemn affirmation:—

I remember the occasion of the disturbance; it was five or six days from the beginning of Ramzan. I am a butcher and have a shop in the meat bazaar. I went to the Halwa shops, but had not bought anything. I saw a crowd quarrelling near the shop of Muallim. There were seven or eight persons. When I first saw them, each man had his string of beads in his hands. They were saying prayers over them and saying "Subham Allah, Subham Allah." They then began to quarrel. I looked on. I saw a servant of Abdu Nabi's, a boy with a blind eye, standing there. Another boy, an Arab, passed him and gave a pull at his coat. Abdu Nabi's servant turned round and hit the other boy with his fist in the neck. They thereupon closed upon one another. Upon this the servants of Kal Awaz (father of Abdu Nabi) came out.

The servant of Ghulum (of Abdu Nabi) tried to stop the two boys, but the other servant hit the Arab boy, who had pulled the blind youth's coat with a stick. The Arab youth fell down. They were separated by other Arabs who had by now collected. At this time Abdu Nabi was standing near Muallim's shop. Abdu Nabi had a mason with him, whose name I do not know, a Persian. Abdu Nabi cried out "Bezan" to the blind boy and to the mason. They went on ahead of Abdu Nabi, calling out "Bezan, Bezan," strike, strike; and any one they met they beat. They had in their hands thick canes from Bombay. The blind boy, when he first quarrelled with the Arab boy, had a thin stick in his hand, but afterwards used bigger sticks which they fetched from the house of Abdu Nabi, about 400 yards away.

I now say I don't know whether Abdu Nabi was in his house or in the Amara or elsewhere. After the two boys were separated, Abdu Nabi's one-eyed boy went away and came back with Abdu Nabi and about fifteen labourers (masons). They all had sticks. They began to beat Arabs and anybody they saw in the bazaar. I went to my house. I got accidentally touched by one stick on the way, but whether it was the stick of a Persian or an Arab I cannot say. I made myself scarce when the beating began. Beyond the fifteen or twenty Persians I cannot say at all how many people there were there altogether, whether there were 20 or 1,000 or how many.

On above being read over to him, he says besides the fifteen masons there were other Persians collected from their shops, he cannot say how many, nor can he say how many people there were, but there were a large number.

Asked if he saw anybody badly hurt, he says he saw two Arabs lying in the road with blood on their faces. He did not help them. He does not know who they were. I went to Mullah Sheikh Ahmed with the others last Friday. Asked by Sheikh Hamad if he saw a revolver, he replies, "Punishment after death is severe; I cannot say I saw any revolver."

(20.)

Mahomed Ali-bin-Buzzeizi, Arab, aged 40, states on solemn affirmation:—

I work with my father, who has a grocer's shop in the bazaar.

I came here yesterday with the other witnesses. I had work and I saw that there were plenty of other witnesses to be examined. I, therefore, went away and told Mansur-bin-Khairullah that I was going to be acquiesced. This morning Vazier Shereideh met me in the bazaar and told me to come to the Agency.

I remember the disturbance that took place at the beginning of the month (Ramzan). On that day I said my "asr" prayers in the Musjid of Jumaan, in which

the leader is Mullah Sheikh Abdul Wahab, son of Mullah Sheikh Jassim. After prayers I went to my shop and did some writing up to about 10:30 (Arabic). Then I went to the fish-market to buy some fish. Before I got there I saw a crowd of Arabs and asked what was up, and they replied that there was a row on.

This was near a shop formerly occupied by a Jew named Razal. I forget who is there now. I stopped there half an hour and looked on. At first the Arabs went away and the quarrel was apparently over. There was a large number, eighty or so. One man, who had been the beginning of the quarrel, was taken away by the Arabs. He was a mulvallad named Saad-bin-Khairullah. I saw them taking him away. I did not see the beginning of the quarrel. I did not see any other people. After they had gone I stopped where I was talking to a bystander, whose name I did not know, about the row. While I was talking I saw some Persians coming along, eight or nine, of whom I knew three, namely, Ramzan, Mahomed Rahim, and one Sadiq. They were running after the Arabs, and wanted to reach Saad-bin-Khairullah. A man named Saad Gahtani put himself in front of them and tried to stop them. They declined, and said they were going to have it out with the Arabs, of whom there were eight or nine still standing about. Saad could not stop them, and they got among the Arabs. I am an Arab myself, but I was not afraid for myself. It was only those who had quarrelled with them that they wanted, the eight or nine who were waiting there and others who were joining them. I do not know the names of any of them. I was quite sure that these Persians would recognize me as an Arab of Kanguni and would not touch me. For that reason I stood still and watched the tamasha.

They fell upon one another with sticks. I saw no one killed or wounded. No one was hurt. The row was stopped in about half-an-hour by one Mahomed-bin-Saleh, a servant of Sheikh Hamad. He and Mansur-bin-Khairullah came in and separated them and they all dispersed, and no one was killed, wounded, or hurt. I then went back to my shop and stayed there till half-an-hour before sunset, and then closed and went home.

I know nothing more.

I went to Sheikh Ahmed's with the other people last Friday (2nd December) and gave evidence. They apparently put down what I said. I have not been anywhere this morning, except to the bazaar. On arrival there I was told to come to you.

No cross-examination.

(21.)

Mutlaq-bin-Mubarak, negro, aged 50, states on solemn affirmation:—

I am a khalassi on general service and get work wherever I can. I have been about thirty years in and about Bahrein.

I was ordered to come here yesterday. I came, and was here till 9 o'clock (Arabic), when I felt ill and went home. I did not ask anybody's leave. This morning a servant of the Sheikh's came and told me to come here, and I came.

I have been here all the month and remember the disturbance at the beginning of the month. On that day I said my "asr" prayers in the Mosque of Jumaan. After prayers I went to the "Sook-el-Maghasis," the pawnshop bazaar. I went and sat in the shop of Ishaq-el-Yahudi. I stayed there an hour. All was quiet there. I did not see any row, but while sitting there I saw some Persians, about five, six, or seven, pass by. They passed by in the ordinary way. They were not shouting or talking. They went on to the bazaar. I do not know any of them, but one of them carried a revolver, and I should know him if I saw him. Although they went by quietly, I particularly noticed the revolver. I followed them about 20 yards into the halwa bazaar. There they began to beat Arabs. The bazaar was filled with a great number of people, Arabs. I did not see them kill any Arabs. I saw two men struck, one on the head, and one on the shoulder, but I did not see them again. I stood there quarter of an hour. I was not afraid of being drawn into the quarrel. Thanks to God's chance, I was not hit myself.

The row stopped of itself and the people left the bazaar. I went home and saw no more of anything unusual. I was sent for to Mullah Sheikh Ahmed's last Friday with the others.

No cross-examination.

Inclosure 29 in No. 78.

Statements of Persons sent for by Resident as likely to be able to throw light on points of fact (Nos. 11, 22, and 23).

(11.)

MAHOMED Sarhan, Arab, states on solemn affirmation:—

I am in service of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed. I have been in his service five years.

On the day that the disturbance took place I had been out hawking. On my return I saw a crowd of Arabs near the entrance of the bazaar. There were Arabs, Persians, and women and were hurrying backwards and forwards. I asked what was up. They said there was a quarrel between Persians and Arabs, and that Abdu Nabi had told his servants to be at the Arabs. I took my bird to my house. Ali Kazim's house is contiguous to mine. I sat down to wash myself.

Meanwhile a woman from Ali-bin-Kazim's house told him that men had rushed into their house. I went out and found a crowd at Ali-bin-Kazim's door, Arabs, Bahreinis, Persians, and women. I asked them what they were doing and told them to go away. The place was full of people. Some went away, some remained. Hereupon the women told me Abdu Nabi was inside and told me to come in. I went in and found Abdu Nabi. He was alone, standing near the door. I asked him how he was and he said, "As you see me." I don't know what he meant. I left and returned to my house. I don't know why the women called me, but perhaps they did so on account of the mob at the house. I then returned to my house and said my prayers.

Afterwards I made inquiries from people as to what had happened, and I was told that Persians and Arab youths had been fighting in the bazaar.

When I saw Abdu Nabi, he was in his usual health and condition. He was not bleeding or perturbed.

There were no other men in the house. I do not know why the women screamed and called to me for help.

I now say that the mob outside were all Persians.

No cross-examination.

Note.—Notwithstanding Sheikh Hamad's refusal to call any one actually implicated I persuaded Vazier Shereideh to bring this man on the grounds that he had apparently partially assisted Abdu Nabi (No. 2), *vide* his statement. He evidently came, however, duly tutored and prepared to lie, and kept changing his statements constantly. His evidence cannot be depended on in the slightest.

(22.)

ALI-bin-Mahomed, Persian of Dayir, states on solemn affirmation:—

I am a labourer under the mason Mahmud working at the Agency hospital. I remember the occurrence at the beginning of the month, but did not hear of it till afterwards. I have never been a servant of Abdu Nabi, but about three months ago I was employed by him to accompany him when he walked abroad and to carry a revolver. This was done for ten or twelve days. The reason was that Abdu Nabi had run down some robbers, Arabs of Bussorah; three of them are still in prison, five others were expelled after a month. He, Abdu Nabi, went in fear of his life and asked me to stand by him day and night for a few days.

Abdu Nabi supplied the revolver and took it back after the ten days were over.

I know nothing about the disturbance except what I heard afterwards by hearsay.

(23.)

MIRZA Ismail, agent of Messrs. Gray, Paul & Co., states on solemn affirmation:—

My ancestors have all been settled in Rangoon for many generations, but I was actually born in Bushire. I have been thirteen years agent for the British Indian Company (Messrs. Gray, Paul & Co.) in Bushire, and seventeen years here in their office.

I remember the disturbance early in Ramzan.

One of the Arabs was sent to give evidence before you by the Sheikh Hassan-bin-Ahmed Ibrahim, and I believe stated that he saw the fracas was actually with me on my premises the whole time that the disturbance was going on, and could have seen nothing. He is a small merchant dealing in mats, rafters, coir rope, &c. He came to my quarters about 11 o'clock Arabic to see me on business. He comes nearly every day. On this particular day he came to ask quotations for London freight for mother-o'-pearl shells. I was sitting outside my office. My office, as you are aware, is on the sea-shore, nowhere near the bazaar. He stayed and talked with me for a long time. About ten or fifteen minutes before sunset, Mr. Milborrow (my chief) came downstairs and asked me to come for a walk, and I left Hassan-bin-Ahmed there with several others who were waiting to see the sun go down in order to set their watches and then go to pray.

I did not see him again then.

Afterwards I met him, after having heard that he had given evidence of an eye-witness before you, and said to him "You who profess to read the Koran, how could you go and pretend to give evidence about the disturbance, when you know you were with me at the time, or at my place right up to sunset." He replied, "I went there after I left you." I rejoined, "but by that time it was sunset, and all the shops would have been closed." He then changed his statement and said, "No, I went before I came to you."

This was obviously false as the disturbance was not known to any of us when he was with me. I did not hear of it until I went out.

My tindal, Ghulam Ali, one of the clerks Abu Talib, could corroborate my statement.

Before me,
(Signed) P. Z. COX.

December 9, 1904.

Note.—The above witness is a native gentleman of education and repute, whose evidence is above suspicion.

Inclosure 30 in No. 78.

Memorandum of Resident's views as to punishments which will meet the case, communicated to Sheikh Isa for acceptance or discussion with Resident and Assistant Political Agent.

1. THAT the following six persons who have been named or indicated should after identification receive twenty-four stripes each, and a term of imprisonment or expulsion from the island.

2. That 2,000 rupees should be paid as compensation to the Persians* through the Assistant Political Agent.

3. That the Chief should station a special guard of his own trusted men on duty in Manama to maintain order in the bazaar.

4. Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed must leave Bahrein at once pending instructions from the Government of India as to his future.

Inclosure 31 in No. 78.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, December 24, 1904.

IN continuation of my Reports, dated the 17th December, 1904, I have the honour to forward a copy of Captain Prideaux' last Report.

2. It will be noted that Sheikh Ali left according to the terms of Sheikh Isa's undertaking, but that he committed a parting act of audacious commandeering at the time of his departure; which I think serves to emphasize the advisability of his being kept away from Bahrein for some time to come.

* That is, 500 rupees each to Abdu Nabi, his father and his brother, and 500 rupees for the remaining sufferers.

Inclosure 32 in No. 78.

*Captain Prideaux to Major Cox.**Bahrein, December 18, 1904.*

WITH reference to the written agreement which was given you by Sheikh Isa-bin-Ali, Chief of Bahrein, on the subject of the expulsion of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed for three weeks from Bahrein, I have the honour to report that Sheikh Ali left for Al Katr on the morning of Saturday, the 17th instant, i.e., within the period stipulated for by you.

2. The last act of this Sheikh was one of open bravado, as he sent his servants out to the down-going mail-steamer "Kangra" and took away by force the three large baggalas which had been supplied by Haji-Abdul-Nabi for the reception of the "Kangra's" cargo; his servants, I am informed, actually cutting all the ropes which connected the baggalas with the ship.

3. The people here speak of this act as one of "Sukhra." It has caused considerable loss and inconvenience to the British India Steam Navigation Company, as the commander of the "Kangra" had hoped to discharge all the Bahrein cargo which he had been compelled to overcarry on the up-journey owing to rough weather.

He arrived here a day late, and the Bazaar Master took some six hours in providing other boats.

The result was that the "Kangra" left here on Saturday morning with some seventy-three packages of cargo overcarried, some of which included all the woodwork required for the Charitable Dispensary, and with a very fair possibility of missing connection with the fast mail-steamer at Muscat.

Inclosure 33 in No. 78.

Major Cox to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, January 10, 1905.

PLEASE refer to your telegram, dated the 6th January, 1905. I think that the arrangement proposed for the 2nd February will meet the case, on the supposition that Captain Prideaux is provided by that time with his sepoy guard, which I can temporarily augment from here if necessary. The Sheikh has now had time to consider his position deliberately, and when he sees that we are prepared to force compliance with our demands, he will, in all probability, comply; but in any case it will be prudent to retain one ship there for some little time after the incident is closed. I do not favour any preliminary threat regarding the seizure of the customs, but recommend that if our present demands are not complied with by Sheikh forthwith, he should be threatened with immediate bombardment of Muharrag, and that a strong detachment of seamen should, if the contingency arises, be sent ashore to Manama in order to protect the European community during bombardment and simultaneously to seize the customs-house, which latter would only be handed back with a British official in charge. I think that the Sheikh might, in any case, when our present demands have been exacted, be plainly warned that any further rejection of their advice in important matters will not be tolerated by the Government of India. If such a warning is given, it may have the effect of causing the Sheikh to accept the advice of the Political Agent regarding the customs when next proffered after a convenient interval of time. Please inform me whether a decision regarding the general question of jurisdiction over the subjects of the Shah in Bahrein has been arrived at by Government.

Inclosure 34 in No. 78.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.(Telegraphic.) P.
BAHREIN.*January 21, 1905.*

We would invite reference to the letters from the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf of the 17th and 24th December last, copies of which were inclosed with the letter

of the 5th January, from our Foreign Secretary. We consider vigorous measures against the Sheikh of Bahrein are both justified and required by the incidents now reported. Sheikh is only confirmed in his obstinacy by our continued forbearance. See Government of India letter of the 21st April last, in which his contumacious attitude in regard to the reform of customs was explained, and, apart from his action in the present case, he has (? proved) himself indifferent to the advice of our newly-appointed Political Agent. The present is an exceptionally favourable opportunity for asserting our protectorate, since objections of an international character are minimised by the fact that German and Persian subjects have appealed to us for assistance. We propose, therefore, that Sheikh should be required—

1. To comply with the three demands set forth in Inclosure 30 of the Political Resident's letter No. 421;

2. To banish Sheikh Ali for a period of five years;

3. To issue notification abolishing "Sukhra," in so far as foreigners' employes are concerned. Subsequent report has been received from Cox, in which the belief is expressed that, if our demands are adequately supported, the Sheikh will comply with them without actual resort to force being required. After our demands have been conceded, we would warn Sheikh that in future we shall not tolerate the rejection of our advice by him in any matters of importance. We propose, after consulting Admiral, that His Majesty's ships "Fox" and "Sphinx" should be dispatched to Bahrein to reinforce His Majesty's ship "Redbreast," which is already there. In the improbable event of it being necessary to use force, 150 seamen would be landed by the Naval Commander-in-chief, in order to protect foreigners and to take possession of the customs-house. Once the latter had been occupied, it would only be restored with British officials in charge of it. We should be glad to receive an early reply to this telegram.

We are sending to Bahrein without delay the small guard to which sanction was given in your despatch of the 5th August, 1905.

No. 79.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir A. Hardinge.

(No. 7.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, February 9, 1905.

THE Turkish Ambassador has protested against His Majesty's Consul-General at Bushire intervening on behalf of the Koweit Arabs in Persia, referred to in your telegram No. 11 of the 6th instant.

It is not, we consider, advisable to claim natives of Koweit as British-protected persons, but you should endeavour to obtain the same privileges from the Persian Government as have been conceded to Afghans in Persia, and which are worded as follows:—

"That the friendly recommendations and wishes of the British Government on their behalf should be accepted."

Telegraph the result of your representations.

No. 80.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 10.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 9th February, relative to the tour of Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel in the neighbourhood of the Persian Gulf.

India Office, February 10, 1905.

130

Inclosure in No. 80.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

February 9, 1905.

(Telegraphic.) P.

TURKISH Arabia: Gazetteer officers' tour.

My telegram of the 29th ultimo.

Resident in Persian Gulf telegraphs as follows:—

"I can myself state that allegations of Turkish Ambassador are distortion of facts. I have called for an explanation, and on receipt of report from officer concerned will reply fully. As regards alleged hoisting of British flag at Koweit, it may possibly have been hoisted by Sheikh on the King's birthday, but not otherwise. The five vessels mentioned by the Ambassador must be the boats of the R.I.M.S. 'Investigator.'"

"Gazetteer officers will leave Bussorah for Muscat on Sunday next."

No. 81.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 10.)

(No. 32.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, February 10, 1905.

NEJD. Confidential.

It has recently been reported to me by His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah that Ibn Saud's father was endeavouring to obtain a meeting with the Vali with a view to offering the Ottoman Government his son's submission.

The Vali has, I learn, been instructed to see him and to report as to what guarantees he is able to give for the good behaviour of his tribe in the future.

No. 82.

Foreign Office to Treasury.

Foreign Office, February 10, 1905.

Sir,

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 31st ultimo on the subject of the recent attack by Lur tribesmen on Colonel Douglas and Mr. Lorimer.

Lord Lansdowne notes that the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury sanction the proposed advance in respect of the losses of the servants, &c., one moiety to be charged against India, pending recovery from the Persian Government.

In reply to the inquiry contained in the last paragraph of your letter, I am to state that his Lordship is not altogether satisfied that the proceedings of Colonel Douglas and Mr. Lorimer were marked by proper prudence, or that they were in no way responsible for the incident. It must, however be borne in mind that these officers have been severely punished for any imprudence which they may have committed, and that the survey which they undertook, in the interests of the public service, could never have been carried out without their being exposed to some danger.

It appears to Lord Lansdowne that, in the circumstances, the proposed advance to Colonel Douglas and Mr. Lorimer for actual losses and expenses and for doctor's fees cannot well be withheld. His Lordship hopes, therefore, that the Lords Commissioners will maintain their sanction to the arrangement proposed in my letter of the 9th ultimo.

I am to add that His Majesty's Minister at Tehran will be instructed to caution Colonel Douglas and Mr. Lorimer against similar acts of indiscretion in the future.

I am, &c.

(Signed) ELDON GORST.

131

No. 83.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 12.)

(No. 34.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, February 12, 1905.

NEJD. With reference to my telegram No. 32 of the 10th instant, I am informed by His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah that the Vali met Ibn Saud's father and the Sheikh of Koweit on the 8th instant at a place within the boundaries of the vilayet, and returned to Bussorah and sent off a long telegram to the Palace on the same day.

No. 84.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 13.)

(No. 82.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 3, 1905.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 18 of the 20th January, relative to the dispatch of Turkish troops to the Yemen, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Aleppo reporting the calling out of twenty-four battalions for service in the Yemen.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 84.

Consul Barnham to Mr. Townley.

(No. 4.)

Sir,

Aleppo, January 23, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that a telegram has been received by his Excellency Bekir Pasha, commanding the troops in this district from the Seraskierat, calling upon him to provide twenty-four battalions for immediate service in the Yemen.

I cannot hazard a guess as to the exact number of troops which will leave until their embarkation is reported from Alexandretta and Mersina, but the mobilization of so many—at least 20,000—men will be very difficult.

Bekir Pasha has replied deprecating the removal of so large a force on the ground that the Armenians cannot be trusted to remain quiet, and has pointed out that the Nizamié regiments are enormously under their establishment owing to the large percentage of men incapacitated by hernia, ophthalmia, and syphilis. They must, therefore, be largely reinforced from the "Ikhtiyat" in order to bring them up to strength.

As there are only four regiments of Nizamié in the district (37th to 40th) yielding, sixteen battalions, the remainder of the expeditionary force would be made up from the reserves. There must be a very large mobilization of reserves to meet this demand and at the same time supply garrisons for the two vilayets. As I pointed out when the reserves were temporarily called out two months ago, there is absolutely no equipment for these men, and they will probably embark in the same clothes as they bring from their villages.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HENRY D. BARNHAM.

No. 85.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 13.)

(No. 87.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 7, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 51 of the 24th ultimo, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Damascus, reporting further on the military expedition to the Yemen.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 85.

Consul Richards to Mr. Townley.

(No. 4.)

Sir,

Damascus, January 24, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 3 of the 11th instant, and my subsequent telegram of the 19th instant, I have the honour to report that it is undoubtedly true that twenty-four battalions of troops are now under orders for the Yemen, of which I understand that eight battalions will consist of Nizam and sixteen of Redif troops. So far as I am informed, six of the Nizam battalions will be drafted from the Aleppo district, while the remaining two will be sent from the Hauran, where they are now serving.

The eight Nizam battalions will be replaced by a corresponding number of Redif battalions, of which six will be taken from Aleppo and two from Damascus.

The sixteen battalions of Redifs, so I am assured, will be drafted from the sanjaks of Tripoli and Jerusalem (eight from each), the former being under the command of Brigadier-General (Liva) Jevad Pasha, the Military Commandant of that district. As to the command of the latter, I do not know to whom it has been intrusted. The whole expedition will be commanded by a certain Lieutenant-General Ali Riza Pasha, the Chief of the Staff in Tripoli of Africa, while Colonels Izzet Bey and Riza Bey, Lieutenant-Colonel Said Bey (from Aleppo), and Major Selim Effendi, all, with the exception of the third, officers on the staff here will serve under him.

As stated before, all these troops will proceed to Ma'an by the Hedjaz Railway. From there they will be marched to Akaba, where they will embark for Hodeidah. I hear that telegrams have been received here from Constantinople asking why the troops have not already been dispatched, and urging greater expedition. The Mushir is said to have pointed out, in reply, that the funds necessary for the fitting out of the expedition were not forthcoming, and that, under the circumstances, it was impossible to mobilize with greater celerity than was actually being obtained. According to a reliable report, a sum of £ T. 6,000 has been promised to the Mushir by the Ser Asker, and it is supposed that an order for the payment of this amount will be received by telegraph.

The two Redif battalions which are to replace those of the Nizam which will be dispatched from the Hauran are now being got ready here.

I hear that the only troops which will leave at once are two battalions of Redifs, which are expected very shortly from Jerusalem, and the two battalions of Nizams now in the Hauran.

All sorts of rumours are current here, according to some of which Sana'a is being besieged by the insurgents, while, according to others, the movement is receiving active support from the British authorities at Aden.

As regards the Nejd, I have nothing further to report. I understand that the Military Committee, which, it is alleged, will proceed to this district, and as to the formation of which I wrote in my previous despatch, is still awaited here by the officer who will form part of it.

Persons coming from the Nejd are stating openly here that England is supporting the aggressive action of Ibn Saoud, and that British officers, disguised as Arabs, are serving under him. I mention this as well as the other absurd rumour about the

alleged connection between the Yemenese insurgents and the Aden authorities to show you the trend of popular opinion. Most people who have spoken to me on the subject expressed their most fervent hopes that it was true.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. S. RICHARDS.

No. 86.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 13.)

(No. 90.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 7, 1905.

ON receipt of your Lordship's despatch No. 24 of the 17th January on the subject of the pirate Ahmad-bin-Selman, I caused a Memorandum, of which I have the honour to inclose a copy, to be presented by Mr. Marinitch, the Second Dragoman of this Embassy, to the Minister of the Interior, again urging that immediate and effective steps be taken to suppress the acts of piracy taking place in the Persian Gulf.

The Minister assured Mr. Marinitch that the wishes of the Embassy would be complied with, and his Excellency at once telegraphed to the Vali of Bussorah instructing him to act in conformity with the demands contained in the Memorandum.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 86.

Pro-memoria presented to the Minister of the Interior on January 13 (26), 1905.

(Translation.)

ALTHOUGH the Ministry of the Interior addressed a communication to the Vali of Bussorah on the 21st (24th) December last instructing the local authorities to lay hands at once on Ahmed-bin-Selman and his associates, who indulge in acts of piracy in the Persian Gulf and especially in the Katif waters, yet, according to information just received from His Britannic Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, it appears that these ruffians have not yet been secured, although the place of their concealment is well known to the local authorities.

In these circumstances, and in obedience to the instructions received from the Foreign Office, His Majesty's Embassy beg to call the attention of his Excellency the Minister of the Interior to the necessity of giving assurances to His Majesty's Embassy that the Imperial Ottoman Government will send categorical and efficacious orders to the effect that measures will be taken to put a stop henceforth to these acts of piracy, that these ruffians will be immediately seized and that the value of the plundered property, which amounts to 9,042 rupees, will be restored to the victims.

No. 87.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 13.)

(No. 98.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 7, 1905.

THE news contained in my telegram No. 28 of the 1st instant that Aarif Pasha had relieved the town of Sana'a is confirmed by the Porte. Later advices, however, state that, unless the reinforcements dispatched from Syria by way of Damascus, Ma'an, Akaba arrive soon, Sana'a will be once more in danger of being captured by the rebels.

It appears that much delay has occurred in the transport of the troops between Damascus and Akaba.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 88.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 13.)

(No. 99.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 7, 1905.

I HAD the honour to inform your Lordship, in my telegram No. 27 of the 31st ultimo, that Feizi Pasha had left Nejd at the head of the expedition against Ibn Saoud.

There is now good reason to believe that a large part of his force has deserted him, and he himself has telegraphed that, unless reinforcements are sent at once, his force will find itself in a critical condition.

I have not been able to ascertain the strength of the expedition.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 89.

Law Officers of the Crown to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 13.)

My Lord,

Royal Courts of Justice, February 11, 1905.

WE were honoured with your Lordship's commands, signified in Sir Eldon Gorst's letter of the 19th October, 1904, transmitting to us the accompanying papers relative to the question of the steps to be taken to prevent foreign interference with the rights enjoyed by the tribes on the Arabian Coast of the Persian Gulf in the pearl fisheries, and requesting us to favour your Lordship with our opinion:—

1. As to the legal rights of the tribes within, as also without, the 3-mile territorial limit.

2. As to the procedure to be followed in expelling interlopers and dealing with their boats and fishing appliances.

We have taken the matter into our consideration, and, in obedience to your Lordship's commands, have the honour to

Report—

1. That the tribes have a right to the exclusive use of the pearl fisheries within the 3-mile limit, and in any other waters which may justly be considered territorial.

As regards the fisheries beyond territorial waters, we think that a distinction must be drawn between the banks where the tribes have practised pearl fishing and the deep waters in which no such fishery has been carried on by them.

As regards the pearl banks, we think that, as a matter of international law, they are capable of being the property of the tribes to the exclusion of all other nations. In addition to the passage cited from Vattel, reference may be made to Puffendorf's treatise, "*De Jure Naturæ et Gentium*," Book IV, Chapter V, section 7, and to the recent work of Professor Westlake, "*International Law*," Part I, Chapter IX, at pp. 186 and 187, and the case of the protection of the Ceylon pearl banks is a striking illustration of the assertion of this right in practice. Whether such rights, in fact, exist with regard to these particular pearl banks in the Persian Gulf is a question the answer to which cannot be given with any certainty, as it depends on the evidence available of historical facts with reference to the enjoyment of these fisheries by the tribes and the exclusion of others from them. As far as we can judge, upon the materials before us, we think that there are grounds for asserting the existence of such an exclusive right, and we do not think that, in point of law, the fact that the enjoyment was by the tribes in common would prevent the acquisition of the right in question. Having regard to the relations of His Majesty's Government with the tribes on the west shore of the Persian Gulf, we think that the existence of this exclusive right may be properly maintained on their behalf by His Majesty's Government.

With regard to the deep waters in which pearl fishing has not been carried on by the tribes we think the case is different. There is here no defined area at the bottom of the sea over which the right of fishing has been exercised to the exclusion of other nations, as there is some ground for saying was the case with regard to the pearl banks. We cannot see that the right claimed by the tribes to exclude other nations from these deeper waters could be asserted with any reasonable chance of success.

2. Having regard to the importance of protecting the deeper waters, and to the fact that, for the reasons above indicated, it cannot be regarded as certain that the right—even to the pearl banks—could be established to the satisfaction of any international Tribunal, we think that it would be preferable to discourage foreign interference by refusing supplies, &c., as suggested in the papers before us. If such measures prove inadequate, it may be necessary, having obtained the authority of the Chiefs for this purpose, to compel the removal of vessels engaged in fishing on the pearl banks. Of course, measures of this kind must be taken with caution, as international complications might result from any precipitate action. It might also be practicable—whether it should be done or not is a matter of policy—to raise the question in a form suitable for decision by The Hague Tribunal.

Fishing within the territorial waters may, of course, be prevented.

Generally, we desire to add that, having regard to the importance of the question to the tribes, and the fact that we cannot be certain of establishing the right claimed, it is probably desirable that the fishing by foreigners should, if possible, be indirectly stopped without raising the question internationally.

We have, &c.

(Signed) R. B. FINLAY.
EDWARD CARSON.

No. 90.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 14.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 13th February, relative to the Muscat customs.

India Office, February 14, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 90.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

February 13, 1905.

MUSCAT customs.

My telegram of the 19th December, 1904.

We have received report from His Majesty's Consul at Muscat to the effect that a temporary decrease in revenue from Customs, amounting to about 4,000 dollars per mensem, is apprehended by the Sultan as a result of lull in demand for arms at Koweit. Present customs administration is a source of great dissatisfaction to Sultan, who is unable, owing to disputes, to obtain from them sufficient funds even to send his steamer to Zanzibar. Circumstances being thus favourable, we suggest that Sultan should be approached with proposals for an arrangement on the following conditions:—

1. That Head Customs Officer, to be nominated by us, should be appointed by the Sultan.

2. That this officer should be servant of Sultan. In the event, however, of difference of opinion arising on any point of importance between His Highness and the Head Customs Officer, the former should agree to accept the friendly arbitration of our Political Agent.

3. Customs revenue of 20,000 dollars per mensem will, on the above conditions, be guaranteed by the Government of India to the Sultan, who will also receive any balance which there may be in his favour.

4. The officer at present in charge of the customs administration would continue to act as deputy.

5. Arrangement to be terminable at one year's notice given by either party.

Political Resident in Persian Gulf is of opinion that conditions specified above may tempt the Sultan, besides being fair to both sides. In order that this favourable

opportunity, which possibly may not recur, may not be lost, we solicit an early reply. If our proposals are sanctioned by His Majesty's Government, we would make immediate payment of 10,000 dollars on account, and further instalment of 10,000 dollars on the day when management of customs is taken over by the new head officer. The deficit would be recovered during the last month of the year.

No. 91.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 45.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, February 14, 1905.

WITH reference to your telegram No. 151 of the 22nd October, 1904, I transmit to you herewith copy of a letter from the India Office on the subject of the violation of the Amiri boundary by the Turks near Kataba.* You will observe that the Secretary of State for India is of opinion that, if the Kaimakam has not been already removed, in accordance with the promise made to you, the question need be no further pressed, and, further, that it is desirable to utilize the present incident in order to obtain from the Turkish Government an understanding on certain points.

I concur in the views expressed by Mr. Brodrick, but it will be better that action in regard to the matter should be deferred until further and substantial progress has been made toward the settlement of the main question of the Aden frontier.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 92.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 51.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, February 14, 1905.

I HAVE received your despatches Nos. 62 and 78 of the 24th and 31st ultimo, relative to the imprisonment at Bussorah of the agent of the Sheikh of Koweit.

It is satisfactory to note that the prisoner is apparently receiving more favourable treatment, but you should continue to press for his release when an opportunity presents itself.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 93.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, February 14, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit to you, to be laid before the Secretary of State for India, a copy of a note from the French Ambassador at this Court,† stating that the French Government are unable to agree to the introduction into the British Case, recently presented to The Hague Tribunal, of the name of the Sultan of Muscat as one of the parties to the discussion of the question of the issue of French flags to Muscat dhows.

Copies of the British and French Cases in this arbitration have been already communicated to you unofficially.

M. Cambon's note has been referred to His Majesty's Attorney-General, and it will be seen from the Memorandum, of which a copy is inclosed, that Sir R. Finlay is of opinion that the Case of His Majesty's Government must naturally be also that of the Sultan of Muscat, in the sense that the acts complained of are infringements of the sovereignty of His Highness, and that so long as the substance of the contention of His Majesty's Government that he has placed his interest in their hands is preserved, no importance need be attached to the appearance of the Sultan's name in the title or text of the British Case.

* No. 74.

† No. 75.

In these circumstances, Lord Lansdowne would propose, if Mr. Brodrick concurs, to answer the French Ambassador in the following sense:—

That the terms of the Compromis of the 13th October, 1904, distinctly indicate that the Sultan of Muscat is the party primarily interested in the solution of the questions at issue.

That His Highness has therefore clearly a moral right to be heard on the subject either by representing his own case, or by intrusting his interests to the care of one of the parties to the arbitration.

That he has elected to commit his cause to His Majesty's Government of his own free will, and not, as appears to be implied in the French Case, in consequence of pressure placed upon him by the British authorities.

That in these circumstances His Majesty's Government do not regard it as essential that the Sultan's name should appear as one of the plaintiffs in the Case, and that it will be omitted in the further documents which His Majesty's Government will present to the Tribunal.

And finally, that His Majesty's Government propose to send copies of the correspondence to the Tribunal for their information.

Lord Lansdowne would further propose that documentary evidence of the Sultan's spontaneous decision to commit his interests to His Majesty's Government should be given in the British Counter-Case.

Mr. Brodrick will perhaps think it desirable to consult the Government of India, as suggested by the Attorney-General, and, if so, his Lordship hopes that the reference will be made by telegraph in order that a reply may be returned to the French Ambassador's note with as little delay as possible.

I am, &c.

(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

Inclosure in No. 93.

Memorandum by the Attorney-General.

MUSCAT.

I do not attach any importance either to the heading which names the Sultan or to the passages in the British Case which states that he has put his interests in the hands of His Majesty's Government.

In the nature of things, the Case of His Majesty's Government must be that the acts complained of are infringements on the sovereignty of the Sultan, and the Case of His Majesty's Government must in this sense be the case of the Sultan also. It was for this reason that to the statements in the body of the Case that the Sultan had put his interests into our hands there were added to the title, I think at my suggestion, the words referring to the Sultan.

But the matter is one of form only, and, so long as the substance of His Majesty's Government's contention is preserved, I should feel no objection to the deletion from the Case of the passages referred to, and from the title of the words which seemed to me to be required as a logical consequence of these passages.

I do not think the form is worth fighting over provided the substance of our contention is preserved.

Possibly the view of the Indian Government should be taken.

(Signed) R. B. FINLAY.

February 13, 1905.

No. 94.

India Office to Foreign Office. — (Received February 16.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 15th February, relative to the proposed naval demonstration at Bahrein, and movements of His Majesty's ships.

India Office, February 15, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 94.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

February 15, 1905.

BAHREIN. Naval Commander-in-chief telegraphs on the 9th instant as follows:—
 "Naval demonstration at Bahrein was arranged to take place a week ago, but I have not yet received any requisition from the Government of India. 'Sphinx' is already at Bahrein, and 'Fox' and 'Redbreast' are at Bushire awaiting orders. Before the 1st March I want 'Fox' to proceed to Bombay in order to be docked. 'Proserpine' will also come to Bombay for the same purpose from Aden, where she will be relieved on the 16th February by 'Perseus.'"

No. 95.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, February 16, 1905.

I HAVE laid before the Marquess of Lansdowne your letter of the 7th February relative to attacks on Germans and Persians in Bahrein by subjects of the Sheikh, and to the measures to be taken for enforcing the demands for redress made by the Resident in the Persian Gulf.

Lord Lansdowne concurs in Mr. Secretary Brodrick's views as to the course to be adopted. His Lordship understands that the naval and military authorities will be kept duly informed by your Department of any action that may be taken.

I have, &c.

(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 96.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 17.)

(No. 38.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, February 17, 1905.

NEJD. Ibn Saoud.

With reference to my telegram No. 34 of the 12th instant, I have received the following telegram No. 16, dated the 15th February, from His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah:—

"See my telegram No. 15 of the 11th instant. The Vali met the two again on the 13th February near the same place, about 30 miles from Bussorah on the way to Koweit, and returned here yesterday. My Dragoman has received indirectly the following account of first meeting. A proposition was made by the Vali to Ibn Saoud's father that civil officials and Ottoman garrisons should be sent to his country. To this he agreed, but said that he would not consent to the Ameer's interfering in any way. The Vali told the Sheikh that his telegram should not have been signed 'Ruler of Koweit.' He would not, however, give way. No definite results were obtained from the meeting."

No. 97.

Acting Consul Monahan to Mr. Townley.—(Received at the Foreign Office, February 18.)

(No. 2.)

Sir,

Bussorah, January 28, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 59 of the 8th December, 1904, I have the honour to transmit herewith copies of two despatches from me to the Resident at Bushire concerning respectively the Fao incident of the 10th October last and the "sadds" (embankments or breakwaters) of Sheikh Mubarek at Fao. The first was in answer to a despatch transmitting inquiries from the Government of India about the Fao incident.

I have, &c.

(Signed) J. H. MONAHAN.

No. 95^o.*Sir A. Hardinge to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 17.)*

(No. 16.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, February 17, 1905.

STATUS of Koweit Arabs.

I sounded M. Naus on this subject before sending in note in sense of your Lordship's telegram No. 7 of the 9th instant. His Excellency states that the Customs authorities acted on orders given them by the Mushir-ed-Dowleh early in December last that the intervention of either British or Turkish Representatives on behalf of Koweit Arabs should not be recognized. He is of opinion, I think, that Koweit is regarded as an independent State by the Persian Government.

A reconsideration of proposed course may be advisable under these circumstances. It would strengthen our claim to request that Koweit Arabs should be treated in the same manner as Afghans, if I can first obtain official declaration from the Persian Government that they consider Koweit as independent, and then communicate text or substance of Sheikh's agreement with His Majesty's Government. May I inform Persian Government officiously, or if necessary confidentially, of this agreement? They might demand an officious explanation of the grounds on which we claim same treatment as or Afghans, if I should ask for it seriously.

Inclosure 1 in No. 97.

Acting Consul Monahan to the Resident, Bushire.

(No. 1.)

Sir,

Bussorah, January 20, 1905.

WITH reference to your despatch of the 8th December, 1904, reporting Sheikh Mubarek's complaint of persecution by the Turkish authorities, I have the honour to state that I have this week sent to Fao to make inquiries a person in whom I have confidence, and that the following is the result.

Early in October last the Acting Vali of Bussorah wrote to the Acting Kaïmakam of Fao that Amir, a well-known robber, and his followers should be taken alive or dead. The Acting Kaïmakam sent a corporal of gendarmes, three gendarmes, and a soldier. When passing through Mubarek's date groves they saw two men, and asked them who they were. One of them gave his name; the other ran away, thus giving reason to suppose that he was a robber. The corporal fired and killed him, and the bullet went through the head of a woman who was standing near. She had in her arms a child, who fell to the ground, but does not appear to have died. The woman was probably killed outright, though there is some testimony, which has an air of seriousness, but which I am not inclined to take seriously, to the effect that she was not killed at all. The killed man was a Persian from Kasbah, not one of Mubarek's fellahs. The woman was not his wife. (She was also a Persian woman.) One of the gendarmes ran away and gave information to the Local Government; the three others were taken captive through the efforts of Mubarek's agent, who now appeared on the scene, and who afterwards gave an inaccurate account of the incident. What became of the soldier does not appear. Eight of Mubarek's fellahs were afterwards imprisoned by the Acting Vali, but all have since been released. Some of the fellahs ran away from Fao, but after a few days returned. The fellahs of Mubarek have otherwise not suffered, and Mubarek's property has not suffered at all. My inquirer spoke with many of Mubarek's fellahs, and they agree with his other informants that there was no such robbery of Mubarek's dates as he alleges.

I have, &c.

(Signed) J. H. MONAHAN.

Inclosure 2 in No. 97.

Acting Consul Monahan to the Resident, Bushire.

(No. 3.)

Sir,

Bussorah, January 28, 1905.

WITH reference to correspondence respecting the "sadds" of Sheikh Mubarek, I have the honour to state that the following is the substance of a report which I have received from my informant, the person referred to in my despatch No. 1 of the 20th instant.

Before the date season of 1904, when Salih Pasha was Kaïmakam of Fao, the agent of Mubarek began making "sadds," of which thirteen, some of them extensive, have been made from that time to now. Mubarek began to attach importance to such work when he got the whole of the Fao property under the arbitration judgment last August. The land between the fort and the sea has gained much—it is said as much as two or three miles' breadth—since the fort was built nineteen or twenty years ago, and the great question between Mubarek and the Turkish Government is whether he may construct "sadds" in the reclaimed land. The ordinary law is that in such a case Mubarek should buy the reclaimed land from the Government, which takes all such land. He reasonably answers that this law is not enforced elsewhere in Bussorah Vilayet. However, he has made "sadds" at a distance of about 400 metres behind the fort, and has carried them southward and northward on to land reclaimed from the sea or river. He was actually (the 20th January) making "sadds," which were nearly completed, "at a great distance" to the south of the fort. This was supposed to be without the knowledge of the Acting Kaïmakam, as the construction of "sadds" was stopped on or about the 16th December, 1904, by official orders, though the Acting Vali, Fakhri Pasha, wrote in October to the Acting Kaïmakam that the "sadds" should not be interfered with. On the 23rd December, 1904, a Commission went to Fao to examine the question, and it reported that the "sadds" did no harm to the fort. Mubarek is on friendly terms with the Acting Kaïmakam,

for whom he has promised to say a good word in the hoped-for interview with the Vali at "Safawan." Mubarek has also promised that, if he fails to get the Vali to confirm him in his position of Kaïmakam of Fao, he will allow him £T.150 a-year. The Acting Kaïmakam and Mubarek have been conspiring together to fix on the officer in command of the fort a charge of extortion. Correspondence has passed between the Vali and Mubarek, in which the latter says he has lost the letter in which the officer demands a bribe. The Acting Kaïmakam tells the Vali that Mubarek has not really lost the letter.

Of the general correctness of the above information I feel little doubt, considering the sources from which my informant obtained it. At any rate, I feel tolerably satisfied that Mubarek has now no serious reason to complain in the matter of the "sadds." He has gained by his "sadds," and added to his property about 2,000 jiribs (1,500 acres).

I have, &c.
(Signed) J. H. MONAHAN.

No. 98.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 18.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 15th February, relative to the recent disturbances at Bahrein.

Copies have been sent to the Admiralty.

India Office, February 16, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 98.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, February 15, 1905.

BAHREIN. Your telegram of the 21st January. Following are views of His Majesty's Government:—

1. As regards trial of ringleaders, constitution of Tribunal is left to your discretion; as regards their punishment, it is considered that expulsion or imprisonment should suffice. Flogging should be dispensed with, as there are obvious objections to it in the circumstances.

2. Adoption of your proposal as to occupation of custom-house is considered inexpedient, in view of the fact that the lawlessness of Sheikh Ali and his Arabs, and the incompetence of Sheikh Esa to control them, is so remotely connected with difficulties as to customs. Moreover, suspicions injurious to our interests elsewhere in Persian Gulf might be aroused by course of action such as you propose.

Subject to the above modifications, which His Majesty's Government consider necessary, your proposals are approved. It will be necessary to take care that an adequate force is employed in coercing Sheikh.

No. 99.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 18.)

Sir,

India Office, February 17, 1905.

WITH reference to the Viceroy's telegram of the 13th instant, recommending that proposals should be made to the Sultan of Muscat with a view to the reorganization of His Highness' Customs Department under an officer to be nominated by the Government of India, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to request that you will move the Marquess of Lansdowne to favour him with his views upon the proposal.

Lord Lansdowne is aware that for many years past the Government of India have

been desirous of effecting an arrangement on the lines of the present proposal, and that the employment of a British official to superintend the Muscat Customs was, in fact, suggested in Sir T. Sanderson's letter of the 7th February, 1898, as an alternative to the control over the Muscat Customs being vested by the Sultan in the Government of India. Mr. Brodrick would be glad to know whether, in Lord Lansdowne's opinion, the conditions which the Government of India propose to attach to their proposal are open to objection from the point of view of the Anglo-French Declaration of 1862, and whether, the local circumstances being favourable, the present moment is in other respects, particularly having regard to the proceedings pending at The Hague, opportune for making so considerable a departure from the *status quo* in Muscat.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

No. 100.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, February 18, 1905.

WITH reference to the last paragraph of your letter of the 12th January, I am directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to state, for the information of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, that His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, who is now on leave of absence in this country, has been consulted in regard to the proposed communication to the Sheikh of Koweit relative to the use of a separate ensign.

Sir N. O'Connor does not see any objection to the adoption by the Sheikh of a distinctive ensign for Koweit vessels while retaining his present flag for use in Koweit, and Lord Lansdowne agrees that such a recommendation might be made to the Sheikh as suggested by the Government of India.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 101.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, February 18, 1905.

I HAVE laid before the Marquess of Lansdowne your letters of the 30th December, 1904, and the 28th ultimo relative to El Katr.

The Government of India, in their telegram of the 30th December, forward and recommend a suggestion by the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf that, in view of the objections raised by Sir N. O'Connor to the proposed Agreement with the Sheikh of El Katr on the lines of the Agreements with the Trucial Chiefs of 1892, recourse should, as an alternative, be had to the revival of an Agreement made with Sheikh Mahomed-bin-Sanee of El Katr in 1868.

Lord Lansdowne does not think that there would be any advantage in adopting this course. The Agreement of 1868 with Sheikh Mahomed is practically identical with the Agreements of 1853 with the Trucial Chiefs, and deals exclusively with the preservation of maritime peace among the Arab Rulers. The Agreements of 1853 were, however, found insufficient to guard against the growing danger of encroachment or interference by foreign Powers, and it was considered necessary to supplement them by the Agreements of 1892, which are at present in force, and are intended to guard against such an eventuality.

It is to provide against similar encroachments or interference that an Agreement with the Sheikh of El Katr is now desired, and, if any such Agreement is to be concluded, it seems clear that, in order to be effective, it should be modelled upon the Trucial Agreement of 1892 rather than upon Agreements which have been found in practice to be inadequate for present purposes.

It might, no doubt, be argued that the revival of the obsolete Agreement of 1886 with Sheikh Jasin does not in the letter constitute a disturbance of the *status quo* inasmuch as that Agreement has never been expressly abandoned or denounced. It could, however, be made thoroughly effective for the purpose in view only by giving it an interpretation considerably in excess of what its actual terms would bear.

The objections to any course which would constitute a departure from the *status quo* apply with even greater force than when they were stated in Mr. Villiers' letter of the 18th July, 1904. For as a result of repeated representations on the part of His Majesty's Government, the Turkish Government have formally suppressed the Mudirate of Wakra, and would now be justified in contending that they on their side have fully acted up to their engagements.

Lord Lansdowne is unwilling to encourage any new departure in regard to El Katr without further consideration. Such a change would be especially inopportune at the present time when a general sense of insecurity and suspicion prevails in the neighbourhood of the Persian Gulf where His Majesty's Government have already more than one embarrassing question to deal with. His Lordship would suggest that the matter should be deferred till the whole question of the policy to be pursued in the Persian Gulf has been fully examined by the Committee of Imperial Defence.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 102.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 20.)

(No. 111. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 14, 1905.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 34 of the 12th instant, in which I informed your Lordship that the Vali of Bussorah had met Ibn Saoud's father and Mobarek-es-Sabah, Sheikh of Koweit, on the 8th instant, I have the honour to state that I have not yet been able to ascertain details about the meeting beyond the fact that Abdur Rahman made humble submission to the Sultan in his own name and in that of his son Abdul Aziz, professing loyalty and devotion to his Sovereign and his readiness to obey his commands. He stated that he was prepared to do all he could to assist the Turkish expedition to the Kasim, and declared Ibn Rashid to be his enemy and to be inciting the Imperial Government against him.

The Sultan has called upon the Grand Vizier for an expression of opinion on Abdur Rahman's protestations.

I understand that the military expedition under Feizi Pasha which left Nedjef on the 29th ultimo has made but little progress. Desertions have been numerous and the expedition took five days to reach Vakissa, after having abandoned the munitions and other baggage at El Hammam. The report which I have received adds that, owing to the weakness of the camels and to some of them having died, the expedition is advancing with great difficulty, and that under the present conditions the provisions in their possession which are to last a month will be exhausted in ten days.

Orders have been issued that steps should be taken at once to remedy this state of things—an order which it may be found hard to execute.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 103.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 20.)

(No. 112. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 14, 1905.

ALTHOUGH the news reported to your Lordship in my despatch No. 98 of the 7th instant that Arif Pasha has entered Sana'a at the head of a relief expedition is confirmed, the news from the Yemen is by no means reassuring. The Porte states that a second column has reached Sana'a, and that the safety of the town is consequently assured, but at the same time it is evident that many other places of importance in the vilayet are being besieged by the rebels, whilst it is said that Khafash Kalesi, a town in the Sandjak of Hodeida, has surrendered with all its military stores. Further mutinies among the troops that have reached Confida are also reported.

The Mouavin (Assistant) of the Vali of Yemen, who has sent a bragging telegram

from Hodeida to the effect that the Government troops are victorious in the neighbourhood of Sana'a, and that the heads of rebels have been cut off and exposed in the town, has been reprimanded and told to be careful, and not to report such unbecoming incidents.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 104.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 20.)

Sir,

India Office, February 18, 1905.

I AM directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to acknowledge receipt of Mr. Villiers' letter of the 14th instant, transmitting a copy of a note from the French Ambassador protesting against the introduction into the British Case recently presented to The Hague Tribunal of the name of the Sultan of Muscat as one of the parties to the discussion of the question of the issue of French flags to Muscat dhows.

In reply I am to inclose a copy of a telegram which Mr. Brodrick has addressed to the Government of India on the subject. On receipt of their reply a further communication will be made to you.

In the meantime I am to request that you will draw Lord Lansdowne's attention (with reference to the penultimate paragraph of the letter under reply) (1) to the letter from the Sultan of Muscat of the 28th May, 1897, in which His Highness asked for the help of the British Government in putting an end to the difficulty with the French Government in regard to the grant of French flags to his subjects; and (2) to the letter from Major Cox of the 20th August, 1903, which conveyed a message from the Sultan to the British Government to a similar effect.

It will also be within Lord Lansdowne's recollection that in May 1900 the Sultan gave to Major Cox the draft of a letter, which His Highness was prepared to sign, in which he proposed formally to request His Majesty's Government to discuss this question on his behalf with the French Government. Lord Salisbury, however, was not prepared to do more than to make a friendly representation to the French Government with a view to obtaining a proper examination of the existing practice and rectification of abuses; moreover, the situation underwent a change in consequence of the Sultan's visit to Sür in June 1903. Major Cox was therefore instructed that, in the light of the view which His Majesty's Government had taken of the situation, it did not appear that the signing of the draft letter by the Sultan would give to the British Government any *locus standi* to act officially on his behalf beyond the extent above indicated. The proposal was accordingly dropped.

I am, &c.
(Signed) HORACE WALPOLE.

Inclosure in No. 104.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, February 17, 1905.

MUSCAT arbitration.

Copies of French and British Cases were inclosed with letter dated the 3rd February, from Political Secretary to your Foreign Secretary. Objection is taken by French Government to Sultan being introduced into British Case as a party to discussion. They base their objection on the following grounds, viz. :—

(a.) That the question being one which relates exclusively to the interpretation of the Declaration of 1862, the Sultan is not concerned in it;

(b.) That he cannot take part in the arbitration proceedings, either directly or indirectly; and

(c.) That it is implied in the British statement of the case that the British Government is the advocate and legitimate guardian of the Sultan.

It is proposed by Foreign Office that exclusion of Sultan's name from future documents should be agreed to, its formal introduction not being regarded as of any importance by Attorney-General. On the other hand, Foreign Office propose to maintain that the fact that Sultan is party primarily interested is indicated by the

terms of reference to the Tribunal; that His Highness has a moral right to be heard, either by intrusting his case to one of the parties, or else directly; and that his case was intrusted to us, not under pressure, as French statement implies, but spontaneously. I should be glad to be informed by telegraph whether you concur in the proposal of the Foreign Office. It is proposed that documentary evidence showing that Sultan's interests were intrusted by him to His Majesty's Government spontaneously should be included in our Counter-Case and all available evidence on this point should be forwarded by you with as little delay as possible. Views of Government of India as to any points which you may consider our Counter-Case ought to deal with should also be communicated as early as possible.

No. 105.

Question asked in the House of Commons, February 22, 1905.

Mr. Weir.—To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, having regard to the fact that out of the 16,000 pilgrims of Egyptian nationality who have started on the pilgrimage of Mecca only 1,600 have availed themselves of Government protection by travelling with the Mahmal, will he, in view of the ill-treatment suffered by pilgrims last year when passing through Turkish Arabia, consider the expediency of communicating with the Turkish Government, in order to secure some kind of protection for the pilgrims who are not accompanying the Mahmal.

Answer.

As I informed the honourable Member yesterday, matters of this kind primarily concern the Egyptian Government.

Representations have been made to the Turkish Government, and it is hoped that there may be no further cause of complaint.

No. 106.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 59.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, February 22, 1905.

THE Turkish Ambassador informed me to-day that he had been instructed to call my attention to the fact that the officers in command of two British ships of war had taken violent measures ("ont sévi") against the followers of the nephew of the Sheikh of Bahrein, who was said to have ill-treated a German subject. The conduct of these officers seemed to the Turkish Government to require explanation. I replied that it was a matter of common knowledge, and well known to the Turkish Government, that His Majesty's Government had direct relations with the Sheikh of Bahrein, and that the island and its natives are under British protection; and we held that we were within our rights in taking measures to obtain redress for the outrage which had been committed there.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

Annex.

Sir P. Currie's Note Verbale to Sublime Porte, August 12, 1895.

ON the 11th November, 1892, Her Majesty's Embassy had the honour to address a *note verbale* to the Sublime Porte, drawing the attention of the Imperial Government to the assurance given on the 10th December, 1871, by Serves Pasha, then Minister for Foreign Affairs, to M. Pizani, First Dragoman of this Embassy, to the effect that the Sublime Porte had no intention of attacking or obtaining any supremacy over the independent tribes on the coast of the Persian Gulf, and stating that, as Bahrein was now under the protection of the Queen of England, no interference by Ottoman authorities with natives of that island could be admitted.

Information was received in the month of June of this year from the Government of India to the effect that the Al-bin-Ali tribe had the intention of forming a Settlement at Zobara, on the

Persian Gulf, with the support of the Turkish Mutessarif of Hasa, who was further reported to have sent troops to Zobara under the command of the Midir of El Bedaa.

These movements, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, constituted a serious menace to Bahrein, and representations were made verbally to his Excellency Turkhan Pasha, whose attention was called to the above-mentioned *note verbale*.

Further information has now been received to the effect that the Mudir of Zobara claims the Al-bin-Ali tribe settled at Zobara as Turkish subjects by order of the Mutessarif, and declares Bahrein unconditionally, and the El Katr coast as partly, subject to Ottoman jurisdiction.

Her Majesty's Embassy have been instructed to address a remonstrance to the Sublime Porte on the proceedings of their local officials on the El Katr coast, over which Her Majesty's Government do not recognize Turkish jurisdiction, and must repeat once more that all Turkish claims to Bahrein, which is under the protection of the Queen of England, are totally inadmissible, and that measures will be taken to protect the island from aggression.

No. 107.

Sir M. Durand to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 23.)

(No. 34.)

My Lord,

Washington, February 13, 1905.

I DULY forwarded to its destination the letter inclosed in your Lordship's despatch No. 24 of the 25th January, addressed by your Lordship to the Chief Justice of the United States, appointing him to act as Arbitrator in the forthcoming arbitration between His Majesty's Government and that of the French Republic in regard to Muscat.

Chief Justice Fuller has now sent me his reply with a request that I will transmit it to your Lordship, and I have the honour to inclose it herewith.

I have, &c.
(Signed) H. M. DURAND.

Inclosure in No. 107.

Chief Justice Fuller to the Marquess of Lansdowne.

Supreme Court of the United States,

Chief Justice's Chambers, February 13, 1905.

Sir,

I BEG to acknowledge the communication of the 25th January informing me of my appointment by His Britannic Majesty's Government to act on their behalf as Arbitrator in the arbitration between the Government of His Majesty and that of the French Republic to determine certain disputed questions relating to Muscat, which, as heretofore intimated, it gives me sincere pleasure to accept.

And also the inclosed copies of the Arbitral Agreement, signed by the two Governments the 13th October, 1904, and of the supplementary Agreement, signed the 25th January.

I have, &c.
(Signed) MELVILLE W. FULLER.

No. 108.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 23.)

(No. 42.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, February 23, 1905.

SOME anxiety is being caused to the Turkish Government by rumoured movements of troops and military stores in the nine cantons connected with disturbed state of Yemen.

I should be glad of your Lordship's instructions for event of my being questioned as to nature of precautionary measures being taken by Aden authorities.

No. 109.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 24.)

Sir,

India Office, February 22, 1905.

I AM directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to inclose, to be laid before the Marquess of Lansdowne, copy of a letter from the Government of India, on the subject of the position of the Political Agent at Koweit.

As regards the steps to be taken for the temporary withdrawal of the Agent, which are discussed in the 7th paragraph of the letter, Mr. Brodrick will be glad to be informed whether Lord Lansdowne sees any objection to the views expressed by the Government of India.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure in No. 109.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Secret.)

Sir,

Fort William, January 19, 1905.

WE have received your Secret despatch dated the 11th November, 1904, on the subject of the posting of a Political Agent at Koweit, and in reply we have the honour to submit the following observations in explanation of the attitude which the Government of India have adopted in the matter.

2. On the 31st July, 1903, the Government of India, in reply to an inquiry from your predecessor, expressed an opinion in favour of the appointment of an Agent; but, in view of objections raised by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, it was ultimately decided to continue the then existing practice of deputing an officer to Koweit from time to time from the Residency at Bushire.

3. In the early part of 1904, a new situation having arisen, in consequence of the armed intervention of the Turkish authorities in the struggle being carried on in Central Arabia between Ibn Rashid and Ibn Saoud, the question of posting a British officer at Koweit was again raised, and on the 24th June you sanctioned the appointment of an Agent in a telegram, in which no words were used which could be held to imply that the appointment was only temporary. On the 28th July, 1904, you ordered Captain Knox to proceed at once to Koweit "in such a manner that unnecessary attention may not be attracted," and this telegram again contained nothing that could lead us to suppose that the appointment was not to be a permanent one.

4. In accordance with these instructions, Captain Knox proceeded to Koweit at the beginning of August, and in a letter dated the 7th September, 1904, he was duly enjoined to act so as not to attract unnecessary attention, but nothing was said to him as to the temporary nature of his appointment. Since then he appears to have confined himself exclusively to the functions which he was authorized by His Majesty's Government to exercise, but no doubt he has done or said nothing that would convey the impression to the Sheikh that his appointment was anything but permanent.

5. Hence the arrangements in connection with the posting of the Political Agent at Koweit were throughout made on the supposition that the appointment was of the character that we have described, and this policy appeared at the time to be agreed to by all parties. From the instructions conveyed to us, we do not see that any other inference was possible. More recently, however, the Turkish Ambassador has been informed that the appointment of a British officer to Koweit is only temporary, and we are requested to take measures with a view to the withdrawal of Captain Knox for a time.

6. We have received this intimation with regret, since the present appears to us to be a peculiarly inopportune moment for the adoption of any measure that may be thought to show a weakening of British interest or a surrender of British claims in any part of the Persian Gulf. You will perceive from the correspondence which accompanies this despatch that, though the Sheikh remains at present well affected towards the British connection, his attitude may, in the opinion of Major Cox, be altered, should existing conditions not be maintained in the future.

Owing, apparently, to the failure of Ibn Rashid to maintain his position in Central Arabia, and possibly to the bad treatment accorded by him to his Turkish auxiliaries, the Porte seems to be seriously considering the advisability of confirming

Ibn Saoud in Nejd, on condition that he accepts Turkish supremacy. Major Cox, in his telegram of the 28th December, considers that the reports of a tendency towards "rapprochement" are well founded, and he considers that the Turks will, when terms are arranged, employ Saoud to seduce Mubarak from his allegiance to us. Major Cox adds—

"As long as we maintain the present arrangement, I do not think we have much to fear; but if simultaneously with 'rapprochement,' we go away or partially withdraw palpable support from Koweit, then the ultimate probability must be the secession of Mubarak."

These considerations derive additional weight from a study of the present position in other parts of the Gulf.

The recent occurrences at Bahrein show that the Ruler of that island by no means realizes the attitude which is due from him to his British protector; and even if the measures which have been suggested to induce him to listen to the representations of the Political Resident are accepted by His Majesty's Government and prove successful, the impression likely to result therefrom in the Persian Gulf generally may be neutralised by any appearance of diminution in the degree of support extended by us to the Sheikh of Koweit, who already suffers for his British connection at the hands of Turkish officials in the matter of his estates at Fao and its neighbourhood.

7. Since, however, a decision has been arrived at in the matter against which it would no longer be becoming on our part to protest, it is our duty to take steps to obey the instructions of His Majesty's Government, and to consider how the manner and date of effecting the temporary withdrawal of Captain Knox can best be reconciled with the exigencies of the local situation, so as to avoid either exciting the suspicion or provoking the resentment of the Sheikh.

The proposal which at present commends itself to us is that Captain Knox should at once inform the Sheikh that, pending the construction and completion of a suitable residence for himself, he does not see his way to spending the trying months of the hot weather at Koweit, and that he has, for reasons of health, applied for, and received, permission to leave temporarily at the end of March or beginning of April, on the understanding that he is to return when the climatic conditions render it safe to do so. A report on this scheme is expected from Major Cox, who has also been asked whether any other ground of temporary withdrawal would, in his opinion, be preferable; and until his reply has been received, it is difficult for us to decide finally in the matter. But whatever plan is ultimately adopted, His Majesty's Government will at once be informed, and it may be assumed that the withdrawal will take place about the date to which reference has been made above.

8. In regard to the observations contained in paragraph 3 of your letter, and of your telegram of the 30th December, we have the honour to state that the instructions to Major Cox in regard to Nejd affairs were not intended to encourage the dispatch of any officer to Riyadh or to any other place in the interior of Arabia, but merely to secure as much early and accurate information in regard to Nejd affairs as could, without the display of undue interest, be obtained by Captain Knox without leaving Koweit itself. This is quite understood by Captain Knox, who has been careful throughout his stay to avoid indiscretion in the collection of information. Moreover, a copy of your despatch dated the 29th April, 1904, has already been communicated to the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf. His special attention has, however, in addition been drawn to the directions contained therein, as well as in your telegram, and he has been instructed to take an opportunity of repeating to Sheikh Mubarak the warning against entanglements in the interior of Arabia which was given him in November 1903 by His Excellency the Viceroy. We inclose copies of correspondence bearing on the points which are discussed in this despatch.

We have, &c.

(Signed)

CURZON.

KITCHENER.

E. R. ELLES.

A. T. ARUNDEL.

DENZIL IBBETSON.

H. ERLE RICHARDS.

J. P. HEWETT.

E. N. BAKER.

No. 110.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 24.)

(No. 43.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, February 24, 1905.

NEJD. With reference to my telegram No. 38 of the 17th instant, I have received the following telegram, No. 17 of the 23rd February, from His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah:—

"With reference to my telegram No. 16 of the 15th instant, I believe account of first meeting to be correct. I have corroboration, including a statement of the Vali to me, as to what passed between his Excellency and Ibn Saoud's father.

"In the second meeting I hear that Sheikh and Ibn Saoud asked for the Sultan's pardon of Ibn Saoud in writing.

"Vali sent letters to the Sheikh on the 14th instant and sent an urgent telegram demanding reply to them on the 20th.

"Vali is said to be in or near Kasim with troops."

No. 111.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir A. Hardinge.

(No. 17.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, February 24, 1905.

KOWEIT Arabs in Persia.

With reference to your telegram No. 16 of the 17th instant, you might inform the Persian Government that, although the Sheikh of Koweit has no doubt certain relations with the Sultan of Turkey, His Majesty's Government regard him as enjoying a large measure of practical independence, and that we have special arrangements with him under which we have undertaken to afford him our good offices.

It will be better not to inform them of the precise details of our arrangements, as they have not been communicated to the Porte or to the other Powers.

No. 112.

Acting Consul Monahan to Mr. Townley.—(Received at the Foreign Office, February 25.)

(No. 4.)

Sir,

Bussorah, February 4, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 2 of the 28th ultimo, transmitting copies of two despatches from me to the Resident at Bushire respecting the Fao grievances of Sheikh Mubarek, I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a further despatch from me to the Resident at Bushire correcting the second despatch referred to, namely, the one relative to the "Sadd" (embankments or breakwaters) of Sheikh Mubarek at Fao.

I have, &c.

(Signed) J. H. MONAHAN.

Inclosure in No. 112.

Acting Consul Monahan to Resident at Bushire.

(No. 4.)

Sir,

Bussorah, February 3, 1905.

THE following correction should be made in my letter No. 3 of the 28th ultimo:—
For "the land between the fort and the sea has gained much, &c.," read "the land between Mubarek's property and the sea, or the river above and below the fort, &c."

I would also modify my statement in the same letter. "He (Mubarek) reasonably answers that this right of the Turkish Government is not enforced elsewhere in the Bussorah Vilayet." I find upon inquiry that the right, though often waived, is in fact often enforced.

I have, &c.

(Signed) J. H. MONAHAN.

No. 113.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 25.)

(No. 44.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, February 25, 1905.

YEMEN disturbances. My telegram No. 42 of the 23rd instant.

News received from Yemen continues to be bad. The rebels have captured Yerim, and practically destroyed Kataba and Ab, and there is danger to the entire Caza of Tanaz. At Hijeh the troops have been massacred by the rebels, whilst in Sanaa itself they are said to be dispirited and deserting. Transport of troops between Ma'an and Akabah is occasioning great difficulty.

No. 114.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 15.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, February 25, 1905.

NO military movements or preparations are, to our knowledge, being made at Aden, as suggested in your telegram No. 42 of the 23rd instant.

If you are questioned, however, you should say that His Majesty's Government must obviously reserve to themselves the right to take any measures they consider necessary to maintain their just claims, as the Turkish Government are still refusing to fulfil their promises in regard to the settlement of the frontier.

No. 115.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, February 25, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit herewith, for the confidential information of the Secretary of State for India in Council, copy of a Report,* dated the 11th of this month, from the Law Officers of the Crown upon the questions regarding the pearl fisheries in the Persian Gulf, which were discussed in your letter of the 30th June, 1904.

Lord Lansdowne would be glad to receive any observations which Mr. Brodrick may be good enough to offer on the matter after considering this Report.

I am, &c.

(Signed) E. GORST.

No. 116.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 27.)

(No. 123.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 20, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 87 of the 7th instant, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Damascus respecting the military expedition to the Yemen.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 116.

Consul Richards to Mr. Townley.

(No. 7.)

Sir,

Damascus, February 7, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 4 of the 24th ultimo, I have the honour to report that since that date two battalions of Redifs have arrived here from Yaffa via Beyrout, while another (also a Redif) battalion has arrived from Hamah. All three battalions have left Damascus for Ma'an.

On the 3rd instant General (Ferik) Ali Riza Pasha, the chief of the staff in Tripoli of Africa, who, as reported in the despatch under reference, has been appointed to the chief command of the Yemen expedition, arrived here from Beyrout. It is not known yet what the General's movements will be.

I should state that a Nizam battalion which was stationed in the Hauran has also left for Ma'an, so that at present there are three battalions of Redifs and one of Nizams now at that place.

In the meantime, a considerable amount of angry discontent has been caused here by the requisitioning of pack animals for the use of the troops, ninety horses and 150 camels having been "commandeered" by the authorities from various civilian residents of Damascus, who are not likely to see their animals again. I understand that the camels will only be employed for transport between Ma'an and Akaba, while it is intended to take the horses the whole way to the Yemen. I hear that, owing to the fact that the contractors have not been paid what is due to them for some time past, they have refused to supply the troops any longer with meat, so that the unfortunate men have been totally deprived of that most necessary article of diet for the last three weeks. Considering that the cold has been most unusually severe here during that same period, the deprivation must have been most acutely felt.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. S. RICHARDS.

No. 117.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 27.)

(No. 124.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 21, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a despatch from His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad reporting on movements of troops at Nejef.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 117.

Consul-General Newmarch to Mr. Townley.

(No. 7.)

Sir,

Bagdad, January 23, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to submit, for your information, the following extract from my diary to the Government of India of to-day's date:—

"The Vice-Consul at Karbala, in a letter dated the 13th January, 1905, reports as follows:—

"In continuation of my report No. 9, dated the 7th January, 1905, I beg to say that on the 10th instant ammunition, &c., with 200 camels came here, and on the 12th the tabour of about 560 soldiers that was waiting for the ammunition started for Nejef. On the 11th instant two other detachments of about 350 soldiers, under the command of Bimbashi (Major) Amin Yamin Effendi, arrived here. They too had 60 camels with them. The strength of Amin Yamin's tabour is said to be 1,100, out of which 350 have arrived and the rest have started from Muntafik. Up to this time about 1,000 camels have gone from Karbala to Nejef.

"It is said that the Mushir has encouraged the soldiers by promising that they would not have to march more than three hours every day, and that he would provide one camel for every three soldiers.

"When the Redif of Karbala reached Diwania, there was, it is said, an altercation between the soldiers and an Arab tribe called Al Shabana, in which one soldier was killed and two wounded. The soldiers wanted to retaliate, but their rifles were rusted and would not work.

"Three days ago a tabour of 900 soldiers with 250 camels has gone from Hindiya to Nejef."

I have, &c.
(Signed) L. S. NEWMARCH, Major,
Political Resident in Turkish Arabia, and His Britannic
Majesty's Consul-General, Bagdad.

No. 118.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 27.)

(No. 127.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 21, 1905.

WITH reference to your Lordship's despatch No. 45 of the 14th instant, in which you instruct me that it is not necessary to press for the removal of the Kaïmakam of Kataba, I have the honour to report that I asked the Grand Vizier yesterday whether the report asked for from the Mutessarif of Taaiz had been received, and if so what action the Imperial Government had taken in the matter.

Ferid Pasha replied that, unfortunately, at the present moment other weighty matters were occupying the attention of the authorities in question. It was true, he said, that Arif Pasha had succeeded in reaching Sana'a, but the road behind him had been blocked again by the rebels, and the Government had been without reliable information from the capital of the province for some time. It was known, his Highness added, that Arif Pasha had endeavoured to open a road to the coast by a southern route, but had failed to do so, and could not hope to make his way back to Hodeida through the 14,000 or 15,000 rebels that blocked the road. There was now a considerable force collected at Confouda and Hodeida, but there was no hope of their taking any effective action against the insurgents until some strong commander arrived to lead them. Such a man was Riza Pasha, who had been sent from Tripoli, in Africa, to take command of the troops in the Yemen; he had already reached Akaba, and was due at Confouda in a few days with reinforcements. Reports that have reached me seem to show that, while the Government troops have been able to maintain their position at Sana'a, numerous posts in other parts of the vilayet have fallen into the hands of the insurgents.

I would beg to refer your Lordship to Lord Cromer's telegram No. 13 of the 19th instant, stating that a mutinous force of Turkish soldiers was on board the Greek steam-ship "Epirus" at Suez, and that the vessel could not proceed on its journey because the captain had not got the wherewithal to pay the Canal dues. Instructions to pay these dues were issued yesterday, but I would call your Lordship's attention to the fact that the vessel was not intended by the Turkish Government to convey troops through the Suez Canal.

She had been chartered to take troops from Confouda to Hodeida, but on going on board the men mutinied, seized and bound the officers, and forced the captain to take them to Suez. This most unfortunate incident throws a lurid light upon the temper of the troops now being assembled at Confouda and Hodeida for the pacification of the Yemen, and it is to be feared that Riza Pasha has an arduous task before him, unless the necessary funds to pay the men the arrears due to them are speedily found. In the present instance the Turkish Government have accepted the inevitable, and rather than betray their weakness have paid the Canal dues for the "Epirus," and have issued orders that the troops are to be landed at Mersina and sent to their homes, where they will be dealt with as may seem right. The stores and munitions, should there be any left, are to be returned forthwith to Hodeida on the same ship.

It is given out by the Porte that the mutineers are time-expired men returning home, a story that is not easy of credence when it is known that all available troops are being hurried to the Yemen with the utmost dispatch.

I am sending a copy of this despatch to Lord Cromer.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 119.

Sir H. Howard to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 28.)

(No. 30.)

My Lord,

The Hague, February 27, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 15 of the 2nd instant, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a letter just received from M. de Ruyssenaers communicating a letter of yesterday's date from M. Savornin Lohman, stating that, as he and the Honourable Melville Fuller, the two Arbitrators in the Muscat Arbitration, have not been able to agree upon an Umpire within the month's delay fixed for that purpose by Article 1 of the Anglo-French Agreement of the 13th October, 1904, the choice of the said Umpire must now be intrusted to His Majesty the King of Italy.

It will be seen that M. Savornin Lohman is of opinion that the said month's delay for the selection of an Umpire commenced on the 26th January last, the date of the letter of the French Minister for Foreign Affairs appointing him as Arbitrator, and consequently expired at midnight on the 25th instant.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HENRY HOWARD.

Inclosure 1 in No. 119.

M. de Ruyssenaers to Sir H. Howard.

M. le Ministre,

La Haye, le 27 Février, 1905.

J'AI l'honneur de porter à la connaissance de votre Excellence que je viens de recevoir de M. le Jonkheer de Savornin Lohman une lettre, datée du 26 courant, constatant que les deux Arbitres nommés par les Gouvernements Anglais et Français dans l'arbitrage des boutriers de Mascate ne sont pas tombés d'accord sur le choix du Surarbitre, qu'ils avaient à élire dans le délai d'un mois à partir de leur propre nomination.

En transmettant ci-joint à votre Excellence copie de la communication susmentionnée, je saisis, &c.

(Signé) L. H. RUYSSENAERS,
Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire,
Secrétaire-Général de la Cour Permanente d'Arbitrage.

Inclosure 2 in No. 119.

M. Lohman to M. de Ruyssenaers.

M. le Secrétaire-Général,

La Haye, le 26 Février, 1905.

D'APRÈS l'Article 1^{er} du Compromis Arbitral concernant le différend entre la France et la Grande-Bretagne, les deux Arbitres nommés par les Hautes Parties Contractantes choisiront ensemble un Surarbitre. Si, dans le délai d'un mois à partir de la nomination, ils ne pourront tomber d'accord, le choix d'un Surarbitre sera confié à Sa Majesté le Roi d'Italie.

Ces deux Arbitres, nommés par la France et la Grande-Bretagne, n'ont pu tomber d'accord sur le choix du Surarbitre.

Comme la nomination des Arbitres me semble datée du 26 Janvier—la lettre du Ministre des Affaires Étrangères de la République, me priant d'agir en qualité d'Arbitre, porte la date du 26 Janvier, et m'est parvenue le 28 Janvier—le délai fixé par l'Article 1^{er} susdit est expiré, de sorte que le choix du Surarbitre devra être confié à Sa Majesté le Roi d'Italie.

En vous priant, M. le Secrétaire-Général, de vouloir porter ce fait à la connaissance des Hautes Parties Contractantes, j'ai, &c.

(Signé) A. F. DE SAVORNIN LOHMAN.

No. 120.

Sir H. Howard to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 28.)

(No. 31. Confidential.)

My Lord,

The Hague, February 27, 1905.

WITH reference to my immediately preceding despatch No. 30 of to-day's date, I have the honour to report that I learn confidentially from M. de Ruyssenaers that, with his intervention, M. Savornin Lohman has been in correspondence by post and telegraph to the following effect with Mr. Justice Fuller as to the selection of an Umpire in the Muscat Arbitration since or immediately after the 1st instant, when the appointment of Mr. Fuller was notified to the International Bureau, viz. :—

In the first instance M. Lohman sent Mr. Fuller the names of the following three members of the Court from which to select an Umpire—viz., M. Charles Lardy, of Switzerland; M. Beernaert, of Belgium; and Professor Asser, of the Netherlands.

Mr. Fuller replied that in view of the mention of the King of Italy in Article I of the Agreement, he would, out of compliment to His Majesty, propose Count Nigra as Umpire.

To this M. Lohman agreed, and M. Ruyssenaers informed Count Nigra of his selection by the Arbitrators, but his Excellency answered that owing to ill-health, which confined him to his room, he could not accept the appointment.

This refusal was notified to Mr. Fuller, and the names of Messrs. Lardy, Beernaert, and Asser were again submitted to him.

Mr. Fuller replied that he would prefer M. Graen, of Sweden, as a knowledge of English was of vital importance.

On the receipt of this telegram M. Lohman answered, likewise by telegraph, that as M. Graen was the President of the Tribunal in the pending Japanese House-Tax Arbitration, he did not think it would do to select him as Umpire in the Muscat Case, and again submitted the names of Messrs. Lardy, Beernaert, and Asser, and added that the month's delay for selecting an Umpire according to the Agreement would expire on the 25th instant.

To this telegram neither M. Lohman nor M. Ruyssenaers have received any reply, and it was for this reason that the former addressed his letter of yesterday's date to M. Ruyssenaers, of which I have transmitted a copy in my above-named despatch.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HENRY HOWARD.

No. 121.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 28.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 27th February, relative to accusations brought by Turkish authorities against British officers in the Persian Gulf.

India Office, February 28, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 121.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

February 27, 1905.

KOWEIT. Please refer to my telegram of the 9th instant. Political Resident in Persian Gulf telegraphs as follows, in reply to telegram which we addressed to him on the 29th ultimo :—

“Your No. 400 E.B.

“I have made inquiry of the officers concerned, and am now in a position to reply categorically to your queries :—

“1. Officers have abandoned journey to El Hasa, and they never contemplated visit to Nejd or Central Arabia.

[1516]

"2. They abandoned their visit to Nejef, and have now left Turkish Arabia finally.

"3. The five vessels referred to by the Turks must be the boats of the R.I.M.S. 'Investigator.'

"4. As regards 'British functionary,' to whom the Turks refer, either Knox or Gabriel, who visited Umkasr, must be meant. Officers were, however, careful not to hold any communication with the tribes, and there is absolutely no truth in the allegations as to incitement of tribes.

"5. British flag has never on any occasion been hoisted by Sheikh of Koweit. It is possible that temporary survey flag was mistaken for the British flag.

"Some protest on our part seems to be called for in view of these sensational and baseless reports of the Turks."

We submit that the time has now come for representation to be made at Constantinople, protesting against the readiness with which baseless accusations constantly brought against our officers in Persian Gulf by local Turkish authorities are accepted without examination by the Turkish Government.